

THE CONGREGATIONAL MAGAZINE.

NOVEMBER, 1839.

AN APPEAL AND PLAN

FOR

CONGREGATIONAL HOME MISSIONS.

THE adjourned meeting of the Congregational Union of England and Wales was held at Birmingham, on Wednesday the 9th, and Thursday the 10th of October. The occasion surpassed in holy interest, the most sanguine anticipations of the members of the Union. In the *Transactions*, &c. for the present month, our readers will find a detailed report of the proceedings of the Assembly; but we feel it our duty to give the most prominent place in our pages to the following impressive ADDRESS from that Meeting to the churches of our denomination, together with the PLAN for CONGREGATIONAL HOME MISSIONS, to which it is introductory. We entreat our readers to give these documents an attentive and devout perusal, which we trust will induce them to co-operate in a project so well adapted to promote the spread of the Gospel throughout our beloved country, and the revival and extension of spiritual religion in our own churches.

TO THE PASTORS AND CHURCHES OF THE CONGREGATIONAL DENOMINATION.

Beloved Christian Brethren,—We have been assembled before God, in anxious deliberation and fervent prayer, that we might be enabled to ascertain “what our Israel ought to do,” in reference to extended and more vigorous efforts for the further evangelization of our favoured country. With great deference and affection we now present for your consideration the results of these counsels.

In examining the plan for Congregational Home Missions now submitted to you, its distinctive points will at once present themselves to view, and we think they deserve your best consideration. They are these:—That the work should be undertaken and managed by churches and their pastors, severally or in associations:—

N. S. Vol. III.—Vol. XXII.

4 U

that THE CONGREGATIONAL UNION, as consisting of confederated churches and associations, shall undertake the proposed Home Missionary operations:—that the entire work should be conducted on Congregational principles:—that appeals for pecuniary aid should be first addressed to churches on the ground of their peculiar obligations and responsibilities:—that lay agency be employed under the superintendence of churches and pastors, but that ministerial missionaries be invariably educated:—that energetic evangelists be sought out and employed:—that stronger churches or districts be brought to aid those that are weaker by a general fund, first obtained and then distributed by a central agency:—that the benefits of centralization on the one hand, and of independent action in every district on the other, may be obtained and combined without incurring the mischief and risk of either when excessive:—lastly, That by the diffused information of a general Report, each district acquainted with the proceedings of all the rest, may obtain the advantage of useful suggestions, cheering intelligence, enlarged sympathy, and perceived mutual co-operation.

The religious state of our country has been brought before us in such a light as greatly to awaken our compassion. Such is the extent of irreligion and ignorance, such the activity and force of moral evil in diversified forms, at the present hour, in this land, that we cannot look upon its condition and prospects without serious alarm, unless efforts far more vigorous than have been hitherto employed shall be at once commenced to evangelize the multitudes of the ungodly among its population. On the other hand, such is the evident favour of God to our country, such the distinguished part she is plainly called, by His remarkable dispensations towards her, to bear in the advancement of his kingdom in our world, that efforts for her religious interests, we are assured, will not fail of His peculiar favour, nor consequently of ample success.

In looking thoughtfully at the present position of the religious interests of our country, we are convinced that an enlightened concern for their improvement quite as much requires faithful testimony to the purity of Divine truth, and of the modes of its administration, as active zeal for its propagation.

We are deliberately and sorrowfully of opinion that our churches have not duly borne their part in labours for the salvation of their countrymen. This is not said without a thankful remembrance of all that has been attempted and accomplished by them in this great and good work. But regret and humiliation for opportunities neglected, and resources unemployed, preponderate.

The state of opinions, interests, and events, at the present crisis, compels us to avow that we cannot profess indifference as to the systems of ecclesiastical polity, in connexion with which the doctrines of salvation shall spread, and churches of Christ shall be gathered, in our country.

We have been anxious to bring into distinct view, and solemnly to press on the thoughtful attention of all our brethren, the consideration, too much overlooked and neglected, that it is the duty of churches of Christ to spread their Master's kingdom around them:

their charge and duty as churches. That churches are Christ's own institution for the spread as well as the preservation of his Gospel. That churches cannot altogether exonerate themselves from attending "to this very thing" in their corporate and church capacity, by the fact that there are other organizations, however excellent, of merely human origin, engaged in that work. One principal object, therefore, contemplated by us in the proposals now submitted to your consideration has been to call on our churches to engage in a work, by the institution of Christ peculiarly their own—that of evangelizing their native land.

We are, however, fully alive to the unspeakable advantages for the work of spreading the Gospel, supplied by the great combinations of Christians, formed in our day by the counsels of the wisest and best of the servants of Christ, and most manifestly approved and blessed of God. We, therefore, desire to see the advantages of both methods combined: first, to see churches promoting their own internal prosperity, by counsels and efforts to spread around them the savour of the name of Christ—then to see all the churches more united in love among themselves, and more efficient in promoting the common salvation by a wise combination, and mutual helpfulness for this great work.

Far be it from us to set up Home against Foreign Missions as a rival interest and duty. Both are our duties. Among all our duties there is an order and a proportion. To discover and observe this order and proportion in the performance of our duties will render the discharge of one an aid and facility in advancing to others. Their countrymen have the first claim on the religious sympathies and efforts of our churches. Every success in this first field of benevolent labour will supply additional resources for extended and distant enterprises, "beginning at Jerusalem."

The independence of christian churches we regard as their glory and safety. To us it seems the law of Christ. Its wisdom and beneficence have been amply confirmed by the results of experience. That sacred inheritance of the churches will never be invaded or infringed by us. Whatever might compromise it will meet with our determined resistance. But we see such advantages reaped in communities far less scriptural, by union of counsel and action, that we ask, "Cannot our churches confederate without jeopardy to their Independence? Cannot they combine and harmonize the advantages at once of independence and union?"—We think they may. In nothing more obviously and safely than in Home Missions.

"Brethren, we speak as unto wise men, judge ye what we say." We respect your understandings as well as your rights. You are accustomed to think and determine for yourselves. Never could there be an occasion on which we would more earnestly invite your free and searching discussions. "Let us, if possible, ascertain what our Israel ought to do." This is no time for individuals or bodies to be pressing plans because they are their own. Let us first take wise counsel, and then enter on vigorous action. If we have fallen

into error, some more favoured brother may detect the mistake. If we have failed to set out the wisest plans and counsels, the Lord may honour others to propose what will meet with universal approbation, and unite all hearts and all hands. Something more than we are now doing must be done—something more than upon any plans at present adopted among us we are ever likely to do.

We have considered the destitution of our country—the inadequate efforts of our churches—the position of our body—the signs of the times—the errors and struggles of the day—the intense feeling and activity at work on every hand—the energy employed on behalf of error in every form. Every thing convinces us that our churches are summoned of God to an arduous dispensation. To bear witness to obnoxious truths; to encounter consequent obloquy and enmity; to pursue a course of difficulty for which they seem as yet inadequately prepared; sacrifices and efforts must be made, such as they at present shrink from. Prayer and counsel are our present duty. Thus may we learn to take just views of our position and prospects, and gain vigour and devotion for our high calling.

We have not been unmindful of a characteristic of our churches and pastors as a body, which we think greatly an honour and advantage to them, namely, that they adopt new measures slowly, and only upon conviction. We have therefore felt less anxiety to obtain speedy and great efforts, than to lay down sound principles, and originate wise plans. If we have succeeded in this design, our object will be accomplished. If we have devised plans for the Home Missionary efforts of our churches, in harmony with their sentiments, and congenial with their constitution, they and their pastors will receive them with gratitude, and adopt them with vigour.

Yet, brethren, if we are not sanguine in expectation of speedy results, we have strong hope of great and lasting good from these the counsels and plans we have been favoured of God to mature. If, indeed, each church can be brought to recognize its Home Missionary obligations, and, entering vigorously upon them, receives in that work even more good than she diffuses—if our associations, formed of churches thus renovated by healthful labours, be modelled more expressly for Home Missions—if all our associations, thus framed and girded for Home Missionary enterprise, become confederated and banded for effort in it—if our churches can become one body for action as much as they are one in common principles and affections—if we can in just proportions, both diffuse and centralize our resources, action, and influence—if we can give to the spiritual welfare of our beloved country the share due to it in our prayers and efforts, then—and these suppositions are not propounded as desponding wishes, but as what we believe both may and will, in due time, be realized—then, with the smile and blessing of God, we shall tell on our country, and, through our country, on the world, as with our theology and with our polity, every sound and enlightened Congregationalist, who loves his principles and his

Master, his country, and the souls of men, must desire that we should.

(Signed) THOMAS RAFFLES, LL.D. D.D. *Chairman.*
 JOHN BLACKBURN,
 W. S. PALMER,
 JOSEPH WONTNER,
 ALGERNON WELLS, } *Secretaries.*

Birmingham, October 10, 1839.

PLAN OF HOME MISSIONS.

I. THE OBJECT.

Home Missions at this time an urgent Duty of Congregational Churches.

1.—That, in the judgment of this assembly, an especial duty, at the present time, of the Independent churches of this country is to unite in vigorous Home Missionary efforts, conducted in entire harmony with their distinctive views of the truth, ministry, and ordinances of the Gospel, and of the constitution, discipline, and liberty of christian churches.

Why Home Missions are now especially needed.

2.—That this assembly, while gratefully acknowledging the efforts already made by individual churches, by county associations, and by other institutions, for the spread of the Gospel in destitute localities, yet recognizes a pressing necessity for greatly increased exertions, and a loud call of Divine Providence to the Independent churches to engage in them, in the following circumstances:—1. The awful extent of ignorance and irreligion which prevails in both town and country. 2. The active efforts now revived for the spread of popery, and the extensive and alarming diffusion, by divines professing to be reformed but not Protestant, of semi-papal doctrines concerning the christian ministry, sacraments, and way of salvation. 3. The absolute necessity of revived and extended religion, and of multiplied christian churches in our own country, in order to sustain the increased efforts so loudly called for in all enterprises for the conversion of the world.

Why to be conducted on Congregational Principles.

3.—That in the opinion of this assembly it is the course of wisdom and duty for the Congregational churches to unite, and conduct their Home Missionary efforts in harmony with the entire range of their distinctive views of christian doctrine and church polity; so as—1. To render the very doing of this great work beneficial to the churches themselves, by promoting among them union and brotherly love, concerted efforts and mutual helpfulness. 2. To multiply churches professing a pure faith, and maintaining a scriptural polity. 3. To show the practical adaptation and tendency of Congregational principles and institutions, both to preserve and to spread, in its purity, the knowledge of the great salvation.

II.—PRINCIPLES TO BE ADOPTED IN THE PROSECUTION OF THE PROPOSED HOME MISSIONARY EFFORTS.

Home Missions the Work of Churches especially, though not of Churches exclusively.

1.—That in the opinion of this meeting it is evident that the apostolic churches were organized not only for the preservation, within themselves, of the pure truth, worship, and ordinances of Christ, but also for the spread of his Gospel in the regions around them, and that therefore Home Missions are an express duty of churches.

Moreover, as in all districts the destitution of particular places, must be best known to the churches nearest to those localities, and the means for supplying it will be best administered by them, so there are some methods of promoting the spread of the Gospel, such as the calling forth and superintending of lay-agency, which cannot be safely and scripturally entrusted to any authority but that of churches and their pastors—that therefore

The Independent churches, be invited to extended Home Missionary efforts; and as the union of churches may exceedingly invigorate such efforts without impairing the legitimate church character of their proceedings, the several associations of the Congregational churches and their pastors, in various districts of our country, be invited to unite their energies in this great common cause.

But as it is believed that in some districts the Independent churches are not in regular association, and as in others the existing associations may not have been formed with a view to Home Missionary efforts, it be respectfully recommended to the pastors and brethren of our churches, throughout the country, either to form new associations, or to remodel those already existing, with express adaptation to concerted Home Missionary labours.

Pecuniary Resources.

2.—That while pecuniary contributions for the proposed Congregational Home Missions may be also sought in the various ways now usual in religious societies, yet, as the object is peculiarly appropriate to churches, and the plan for attaining it is built on their constitutional principles, therefore it is the judgment of this assembly that the primary and especial appeal for pecuniary aid shall be made to churches, and every church shall be invited to make an annual contribution, however small, for the general Home Missionary fund, in addition to whatever may be raised by it in aid of the county association with which such church may be connected, or for Home Missionary labours, more exclusively its own—because, in the distribution of the general fund, the churches which need assistance would receive back their contributions with increase, and the stronger would be aiding the weak; while no principle in raising the general fund is applicable but that of universal contribution.

Towns, as well as Rural Districts, to be embraced in Congregational Home Missions.

3.—In the opinion of this assembly, the efforts of the Union in

Home Missions must be directed to missionary operations, both in towns and in the rural districts, whenever co-operation in such objects is desired of the central committee by brethren associated in the Union, and having the management of the efforts of the churches in the neighbourhoods for which assistance is desired.

Parts to be borne respectively by the Central Committee, and by Churches, or Associations locally.

4.—That, in the view of this meeting, when the Congregational Union shall enter upon Home Missions, the associations in their several districts, and the committee of the Union, will each find appropriate and mutually helpful departments of labour. The brethren of the several associations would manage all operations within their own districts, have the entire disposal of all funds raised for county and local objects, the obtaining and remitting of all church and other contributions for the general purposes of the Home Mission of the Union, all lay-agency, out-of-door preaching, village stations, and attempts to originate new interests. The central committee would apportion grants of money, send desired delegations of ministers, afford solicited counsel, and train and recommend missionaries.

Education of Ministerial Missionaries indispensable.

5.—This assembly declares its deliberate opinion, that while lay-agency, if wisely directed, may be of great importance and use in Home Missions, yet as a ministerial missionary, ordained for the work, and recognized by the proposed Union, no one ought to be so employed, without appropriate education for the work. Every candidate for employment as a ministerial Home Missionary, under the patronage of the Congregational Union, shall therefore receive a suitable training; unless, in any particular instance, evident preparation for the work is already possessed, in strong natural powers and acquired knowledge. Nor ought any ministerial missionary to be wholly or in part supported by the funds of the General Union, who has not the full sanction of its committee. To provide for and superintend the education of Home Missionaries, will, in the opinion of this assembly, be a principal duty of the central committee, requiring their most vigorous and persevering attention.

Evangelists to be employed.

6.—That, in the judgment of this assembly, past experience, as to the most efficient methods of arousing a careless, irreligious population, and the present state of our country, unite to show that it will be most important to obtain, if possible, for periods of service as evangelists, the labours of ministers endowed with courage, power, and zeal, who might break up new ground, by preaching in the open air, or in public buildings not usually employed for worship; and generally by efforts at once bold, enterprising, and calculated to excite attention, yet prudent and well directed, accomplish ends unattainable by more regular and customary labours; but none to be employed unless approved by the central committee, nor

in any locality, but in co-operation with the brethren managing the Independent Home Missionary efforts of that district.

The best Gifts and great Devotedness required for Home Missions.

7.—That, in the opinion of this committee, there is required, in the great work of Home Missions, to which the Congregational churches are now invited by the signs of the times and the call of Providence, a high spirit of enterprise and liberality, as well as of faith and prayer—that timid counsels and feeble efforts are not what present exigencies demand. Men endowed by the Great Head of the church with gifts and graces must be sought, placed in stations where their labours are at once needed and invited, and adequately supported. This assembly regards the work to which the churches are now invited as one in which all their strength must be united and well directed.

The Prosperity and Usefulness of Congregational Churches will be greatly advanced by Union in Home Missionary Labours.

8.—That, in the judgment of this assembly, the union in Home Missionary work of the Congregational churches now recommended, will be found admirably adapted to promote among them the spirit of union, sympathy, and mutual helpfulness. When they feel that they are all united in one work, and that in the general body, by a wise and well-adjusted fellowship, all that can afford it are giving aid, and all who need it are receiving aid; when every section of our body is learning, by a digested annual report of all the associations, the state and progress of all the rest, then it may be expected that the churches will grow strong, and joyful, and successful, in fellowship so truly fraternal and scriptural.

General Education an important Auxiliary to Home Missions.

9.—That as all the great ends of the Gospel are to be attained by diffusing the knowledge of its holy truth, and as to enlighten men in the doctrines of salvation is the true method to benefit and save them, this assembly considers the religious education of the young in Sunday and daily schools, a most important branch of Home Missionary operations; and would earnestly recommend that it be connected, to the greatest extent practicable, with all the efforts of the churches, for the further evangelization of their native land. And this assembly also declares its opinion, that as one of the most important of the indirect and subordinate effects of the diffusion of the Gospel will be powerfully to promote the spread of general intelligence throughout society, so that the wide prevalence of general knowledge and enlightened thinking must exceedingly subserve the cause of pure and genuine Christianity.

Divine Influence essential to Success in Home Missions.

10.—That this assembly declares its solemn and devout conviction, that the church of Christ can attain no real success in enterprises for the enlargement of His kingdom in the world, apart from Divine influence on the souls of men, in connexion with her efforts. And

this assembly further declares the great object of the Home Missions now contemplated, to be that true conversion to God of the souls of men, for the production of which human instrumentality must be employed, in a constant dependence on the promised grace and power of the Holy Spirit; and in the attainment of which all subordinate benevolent purposes will be most effectually secured.

Prayer for the Influence of the Holy Spirit essential to success in Home Missions.

11.—That it is the full persuasion of this assembly, that as Divine influence can alone secure success in labours for the salvation of men, so that influence will surely be vouchsafed in answer to believing prayer; and, further, that a humble and fervent spirit of prayer is the only temper in which the churches of Christ can enter upon such labours, so as to please God, to benefit themselves, and to realize their object; therefore this assembly affectionately desires, of all their brethren, persevering prayer for the Divine blessing on this entire project for extended Home Missions.

A Sectarian Spirit and Object in this Plan for Home Missions disavowed.

12.—That this assembly now makes a distinct public declaration, that this plan for Home Missions, on Congregational principles, has been adopted, as, in its judgment, the most scriptural method for promoting the great objects of the Redeemer's kingdom. But while this assembly would thus follow its own conscientious views of truth and duty, in labours for the good of the church and the salvation of men, it would stand prepared to hail, with heartfelt joy, such success in the same work, as may be granted by the Great Lord of the whole church to bodies of his servants, acting on other convictions, and adopting other plans, in respect to points acknowledged by all to be subordinate.

III.—THE CONGREGATIONAL UNION TO UNDERTAKE HOME MISSIONARY WORK.

I.—That it is the judgment and recommendation of this assembly,

1.—That the Congregational Union of England and Wales shall undertake Home Missions, under the designation of The Home Mission of the Congregational Union of England and Wales.

2.—That the Congregational Union shall hold a distinct annual meeting for this object; when a general and cash report of the Home Mission fund for the year then ending shall be presented, and the general business of the Union in relation to Home Missions shall be transacted.

3.—That at this special meeting of the Congregational Union for its Home Missionary business, in addition to the present constituency of the Union, every subscribing church (otherwise eligible for membership in the Union) may send two delegates, who shall be entitled to speak and vote at such meeting.

4.—That all the proceedings of the Home Mission of the Union shall be conducted in accordance with the foregoing resolutions, which

shall be taken to be the principles and laws regulating all its affairs and operations; and not to be altered but by vote of a general meeting.

II.—That this assembly now appoints the evening of Monday, the 9th of May, 1840, for a meeting of the assembly of the Congregational Union, to be holden in Finsbury Chapel, London, when the resolutions of this assembly shall be submitted for ratification, and it shall be proposed that the Congregational Union commence its Home Missionary operations.

A WORD FOR GEOLOGY.

(To the Editor.)

THROUGH the medium of your pages, I wish to offer a few remarks on the subject of geology. Whilst that science is so fiercely assailed, it is surely the duty of all its students to correct misrepresentations, and zealously to support its claims. Like astronomy, in its infant state, geology has had to contend with popular prejudice, which has retarded its progress, and brought the science itself into disrepute. If the following remarks shall correct one mistaken idea which may be entertained as to the phenomena which geology presents to our notice, if they communicate but one fact connected with the argument, the cause of truth will be promoted, and your pages will not have been occupied in vain.

It was long ere the distinct nature, and legitimate objects of geology were fully recognized, and it was at first confounded with many other objects of inquiry. In 1775, Werner seems to have regarded it as subordinate to mineralogy, and as Professor of the School of Mines, at Freyberg, in Saxony, applied it to the art of mining; and Desmarest included it under the head of physical geography. Hutton was the first who declared that geology was in no way concerned with the questions "as to the origin of things." He published his "Theory of the Earth" in 1778, and dispensing entirely with hypothetical causes, endeavoured to account for the changes that the earth's crust had undergone, by reference exclusively to natural agents. The opinions of Hutton were violently opposed by the disciples of Werner; and from the different views which they took as to the agency of fire and water in the production of strata, the scholars of Werner were known by the name of Neptunists, and those of Hutton were called Vulcanists: and the controversy between the rival schools was carried to such a height, that their names became terms of reproach. A new school at length arose, professing the strictest neutrality, and the utmost indifference to the systems of Hutton and Werner. Soon after this the London Geological Society was formed, whose object was *to record ascertained facts, not to form theories*. They did not consider the time had arrived to form a general system of geology. They saw the error into which their predecessors had fallen, in being too anxious to form systems, and contented themselves in accumulating facts for future generalizations. A vast mass of information as to geological phenomena and fossil

remains has been thus acquired, which now presses upon our consideration, and can no longer be postponed. The great advances which have been made in mineralogy, chemistry, botany, zoology, and comparative anatomy, within the last fifty years, enable the geologist to assume a position which previously he was unable to occupy. He is no longer required to inhabit the regions of fancy, but establishes his conclusions on the firm basis of philosophical induction. Let us see the nature of some of the phenomena upon which the geologist firmly relies. It is a well ascertained fact, that if we pierce through the surface of the most level parts of the world, it is found to consist of horizontal layers of strata, continued with an uniform regularity to a great depth. That these strata preserve a certain order of disposition, from which they are never known to depart; that is, each particular rock retains its relative position with regard to the mass. As to their organic remains, it is found that the deeper we descend into the earth's crust, the more widely do they differ from existing species; and when we arrive at the primary rocks, which are the deepest accessible to man, we lose all traces of their existence. The first vestiges of animal remains are met with in those rocks resting upon the primary, which are termed the transition. They consist of zoophytes, and shell-fish, which are considered as forming the lowest link in the scale of animal creation; and appear first to have received the gift of life. Above these, in the secondary rocks, a very distinct assemblage of fossil remains occur, all of unknown species, and many of them of gigantic size. The vertebrated animals, which are very abundant, are almost entirely confined to fish and reptiles. Between the formation of the secondary and tertiary rocks, a considerable period of time seems to have elapsed, for it is a striking fact, that none of the organic remains found are common to the two formations. There is a marked difference in every class of shells, plants, and animals. The gigantic reptiles of the secondary period, are not found in the tertiary, but numerous warm-blooded animals make their appearance. From the regularity of the strata, and condition of the fossil remains, it is inferred that the earth was at this time in a perfectly settled state, and must have been densely peopled by organized creatures. These are some of the leading facts geology presents to our notice. If a person unacquainted with these facts were to ask, "Amongst the various extinct races of organized beings, with which the strata of the earth abound, do you not frequently meet with human remains?" The geologist would reply, "That no vestiges of human bones have as yet been discovered throughout the entire range of geological formations." "How then," it may be enquired, "do you account for this?" "The inference which we naturally draw from this striking fact is, that these animals lived and died before man's creation. Human bones are as durable as those of other animals. In Egyptian mummies no difference is observable between the bones of men and of quadrupeds. Indeed, they would have been far more likely to have left their remains or their impressions on the rocks, than the tender leaves of plants or integuments of animals. Neither can it be accounted for by the different habits of men and quadrupeds. Man, more than any other land animal, exposes himself upon the waters, *his* remains, therefore, *more than theirs*, would be

sought for in ancient watercourses. If, in the future researches of geology, human bones should be found in the older formations, and in conjunction with the extinct races of animals, it would be impossible any longer to reconcile the extended periods assigned by geology, to the formation of strata, and the duration of species, with our received chronology; whilst their absence would favour the hypothesis of the comparatively recent origin of man."

The effects of the deluge on the surface of the earth have been greatly exaggerated in the minds of many, who are prepared to ask, "Might not all the strata have been formed by the flood? for how can we tell what changes were produced upon the crust of the earth by that visitation?" The geologist replies, "That no inundation of so short a continuance, could possibly have produced so great a thickness of strata, or have left throughout them distinct classes of organic remains, deposited in a uniform and undeviating order. The diluvial, or superficial deposits of sand and gravel, are thought by some to owe their origin to the effects of the historical deluge; yet the large preponderance of extinct species among animals whose remains are found in them, and the total absence of human bones, strongly favour the opinions of others, who refer even these to a period anterior to the creation of man." It may also be asked, "Are not the existing species of animals mere varieties or modifications of those which, at the flood, suffered destruction?" We answer, that "the celebrated comparative anatomist, Cuvier, has clearly shown, that however species may become altered by the local circumstances of food and climate, yet that they are never entirely changed; the Creator seems to have guarded against this by the mutual aversion with which he has inspired them. And amongst fossil remains, we meet with none of those intermediate forms which, in all probability, would exist, were this a correct idea. Lamark's theory of gradual development will not help us out of the difficulty, for we cannot condescend to suppose that the human race sprung originally from the ouran-outang." Admitting these statements to be true, a serious inquirer would naturally feel anxious to know how to reconcile geological conclusions with the sacred writings, especially the Mosaic account of the creation. The most celebrated geologists of modern times (and of course the most valued as to their conclusions) have professed the greatest deference to the "Word of eternal Truth." They have confessed that, "to assume that the evidence of the beginning or end of so vast a scheme lies within the reach of their philosophical enquiries, or even of their speculations, is inconsistent with a just estimate of the relations which subsist between the finite powers of man, and the attributes of an infinite and eternal Being."* With such reverential feelings, they call upon their readers to consider attentively, and with an unprejudiced mind, the short account of the creation contained in the first chapter of Genesis, and to see if any conclusions which they have drawn from the facts which the study of geology has brought to their notice, are at variance with the statements therein contained. Thus, in the first and second verses we are informed, that "In the beginning

* Lyell, vol. iii. p. 384.

God created the heavens and the earth. That the earth was without form, and void, and darkness was upon the face of the deep." Enough is contained in these few words to refute the atheistical assertion, "That matter is eternal;" but as a further revelation is not necessary to the welfare of man, the sacred historian passes on to the epoch immediately preceding his creation, that is, the commencement of the first evening of creation—all the time requisite for the production of geological phenomena may have elapsed between the period referred to in the first verse, and the commencement of the six days' works of creation, beginning at the third verse. It must not be supposed, that the sense of scripture has been distorted merely to suit the views of geologists, for, long before their time, it was a subject of dispute with the fathers of the church, whether these verses had any immediate connexion; and thus we are informed in Luther's Bible, the figure one is affixed to the third verse of our English version. What is there, I would ask, in these views of the subject, which has the least tendency to diminish our religious reverence? Does it not, on the contrary, so exalt our conceptions of the infinite Creator, that in the contemplation of such boundless scenes, we find ourselves lost "in wonder, love, and praise." Let us respond to the sentiments of our great epic poet, when he says,

" A desire which tends to know
The works of God, thereby to glorify
The great Work-master; leads to no excess
That reaches blame, but rather merits praise."

Geology is steadily progressing; it is bravely weathering the storm of popular prejudice. Individuals, esteemed for their learning and piety, are almost daily joining the ranks of its friends, who, ere long, may have the gratification of seeing geology united with astronomy, as the obedient handmaids, not the enemies, of Revelation. I trust, Sir, to your desire of promoting that discussion which elicits truth for the insertion of this letter, and subscribe myself,

Yours, &c.

J. W.

THE NATURE OF CHRIST'S PRESENCE WITH HIS MINISTERS.

(To the Editor.)

I PRESUME that the paper inserted in your last Magazine, p. 637, and signed D. E. F., is intended as an answer to my letter of the former month, though, I confess, but for some indistinct allusions in it to a few of my expressions, I should scarcely have ventured on such a conclusion. He who undertakes to answer another's arguments is, I think, bound to show the error either of his antagonist's premises, or of his deductions. However, I am abundantly willing to meet D. E. F. on the ground which he has chosen as the arena of combat, and before I enter the lists, I would convey to him my thanks for the temperate style in which his animadversions are delivered, and would take also the opportunity of expressing my con-

viction, that he is prompted to the discussion of the present question, equally with myself, by a love to our common faith, and a desire to have clear and determinate views of its principles. Being thus agreed in the most important points, I feel that our entire agreement is facilitated, and that nothing is wanted to effect that most desirable union of sentiment but the removal of some clouds of mystification which at present cover the mental vision of one or other of the disputants. Let me, however, suggest to my respected antagonist, in order to corroborate my above-mentioned charge, that I expected from any one who would undertake to be my answerer, that he should evince the weakness of my proofs from scripture that the word *αιων* does sometimes mean a period less than proper eternity, and that in the cited text, Matt. xxviii. 20, it necessarily means that limited time, especially as I had appended to the statement of the view I entertained no less than six different absurdities, in one or other of which he must be involved, who conceives that the word *αιων*, in that passage, must be taken for eternity. Not one of these absurdities is even attempted to be removed. I pointed out as clearly as I could the various senses in which this presence, in relation to human beings, could be understood; namely, first, as the presence of God with all his works, in giving them existence. In this sense I contended the promised presence could not be taken, as the promise was addressed to ministers alone, but the providential presence of God is common to all beings; or secondly, as the gracious presence of Christ with his people, his church, but neither could this gracious sense be that intended by the promise, as that was addressed to ministers and not to the people of God generally; or finally, as the particular and supernatural presence of God peculiar to men inspired, and by which they were rendered capable of miraculous powers; but this sense was opposed to the facts of the case, according to both the evidence of sense and my antagonist's acknowledgment.

Now it behoved my answerer to show that there was some other sense in which Christ's presence with his ministers could be understood, and then that, in that sense, Christ is really present, and present with all his ministers. Till this be done, I venture to say that my principles are untouched. That method of answering an adversary, in which his arguments are altogether disregarded, will scarcely appear satisfactory to an inquiring mind. As, however, my opponent, D. E. F., prefers this method of combating my principles, I will meet him on the ground he prefers.

I presume the first paragraph of my antagonist is merely a graceful flourish of his dialectical weapon, to warn me by the terrible wounds he inflicts on some unknown adversary, of my impending fate. Certain it is that I have not advocated any of these opinions, and so feel myself quite absolved from the perilous task of defending myself from this attack.

D. E. F. next supposes that the views which I had presumed to advocate on a former occasion were the reaction of certain well-known Oxford Tracts on my mind. Indeed these tracts would be well entitled to the epithet *far-famed*, with which he characterises

them in a former paragraph, if they had such, or indeed any kind of reaction on my mind, as I have never myself read or heard another read one line of these *far-darting* as well as *far-famed* missiles of destruction. If my views are the result of any reaction, they are the legitimate reaction of the acknowledged principles of certain dissenting ministers, who will claim for themselves, from the text in question, a presence of Christ, which I never found that any one of them could explain, and which, in truth, admits of no explanation, and would, if granted, utterly deprive all protestants, but especially dissenting protestants, not only of the promise as claimed, but of all other promises respecting them as ministers, and even as Christians. I am convinced that my brethren generally have that just hatred to the principles of popery, founded on its opposition to scripture, which would effectually prevent them from embracing that system; but I assert that, holding my opponent's view of Matt. xxviii. 20, they could not defend themselves from the undeniable inference, that the Pope, being the undoubted successor of some Apostle, Christ is with him, and therefore, as Christ cannot be said, in any intelligible sense, to be equally present with two parties diametrically opposing each other on important points of scripture doctrine, it follows that he is with him alone, who is the true successor, which the dissenter does not even profess to be, and if he did profess, could not establish. The acknowledged successor is therefore justified in denying his opponent's claim, and in denying farther, that any one but himself, or those who agree with him, have any ministry at all. Having myself been, at one period, a professed papist, and having been brought from that delusion by the word of inspiration, I feel that we are only safe from the insidious poison of that system by a firm and simple adherence to God's word of revelation. It was a persuasion of the inconsistency of this view of T. K. and others with the word of testimony, which first led me to examine its evidence, and I now unhesitatingly avow my belief of its unscriptural nature and dangerous tendency.

In the same paragraph D. E. F. asserts, that according to my view, "the world is now without a church, and man without religion." Does D. E. F. think that it follows from the principle that the promise of Matt. xxviii. 20, has no reference to ministers of the present day, that there is no church in the world? Does the church include none but ministers? I had thought that the church included the whole of God's people, and that ministers were but a part of the church? Does the being of the church depend on the fact of Christ being with his ministers, in a sense which neither D. E. F. nor any one else can explain? The tenure of the church's existence is indeed very insecure if it depend on a presence of Christ with his ministers, which presence is utterly unintelligible, and which, on the confession of my adversaries, confers neither infallibility nor any imaginable privilege. I conceive the existence of a church in the world is grounded on the fact of there being a society of men who hold the truth of God as revealed in the Bible, and who worship God according to that revelation. D. E. F. further says, that, admitting my principles, "man is without re-

ligion." I have ever thought that religion is utterly independent on man's authority; that the reception and avowal of the christian religion would be my clear and manifest duty, were there no other professed Christian in the world to authenticate its claims. What authority the christian religion would lose in its claim upon my faith and obedience, were there no christian minister in the universe, I am utterly at a loss to conceive; still more do I wonder how the obligations to believe could be lessened by the proof that none of that unintelligible presence of Christ, for which D. E. F. pleads, were now enjoyed. I thank God that my belief in Christianity is not of so weak a texture, and that my religion owes none of its reality, or its vigour to my acquiescence in what is to me unintelligible, and is by all incapable of explanation. My belief in the religion of the Bible is stronger in proportion as I can abstract my view more entirely from men, and especially from priests, and seek its evidence and its doctrines in the only record I acknowledge, the volume of inspiration.

In the next paragraph, D. E. F. supposes that my restricting the promise of Matt. xxviii. 20, to the apostles alone, restricts also the duty commanded in the preceding verse to the apostles, and that, consequently, preaching the gospel is not now the duty of ministers generally. But does D. E. F. suppose that this duty is commanded only in the text to which we refer? Does it not occur in a hundred different places of scripture? Is it not distinctly referred to by the Apostle Paul, 1 Eph. iv. 11, 12, 13? and is it not there intimated that the administration of church officers is to continue "till we all come to a perfect man, to the stature of the fulness of Christ?" There is, therefore, no fear of losing our authority to preach the gospel, though we cease to claim the controverted promise as applying to us. Is D. E. F. ignorant that a command might be addressed to the apostles in their general capacity of ministers, whilst a promise applicable to them only as apostles is connected with it, especially as we perceive that the labours of the apostles were to be carried on at such times and under such circumstances as required the peculiar gifts included in that promise; namely, the gifts of miraculous power and infallibility; and finally, when we have incontestible proof that the apostles did enjoy a very particular presence of their Master, in the ability of performing miracles in proof of the verity of their mission, and of an infallibility in delivering doctrine, though possessed of no written New Testament documents from which they could draw their instructions, or to which they could refer their hearers? Does D. E. F. mean to assert that ministers need the same powers now as the apostles possessed? Is the church built on our foundation of infallibility? Eph. ii. 20. If not, let him cease to quote Matt. xxviii. 20 as belonging to him, or let him take also the benefit of the promise, Matt. x. 20, "It is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." Here is direct full inspiration. Does Matt. xxviii. 20, belong to ministers? On the same principle so does this of Matt. x. 20. I am persuaded that the confounding of what is spoken to and of inspired men, the subjects of the special gifts of the Spirit, with that which relates to other servants of the Lord the subjects only of the ordinary graces

of the Spirit in regeneration and sanctity, is the root of more evils than any other mistake into which our erring race has fallen. I need not attempt to prove that the follies of ancient mysticism and the early Quakers, the wicked pretences of the enthusiasts of popery, and the mad rhapsodies of the late Mr. Irving, and other misguided men, owe their existence to this besotted mode of interpreting the scriptures of God. There is abundant evidence in all cases of the limitation of such promises. We may be certain, in the case in point, that as we cannot, like the apostles, perform these miraculous works, the promise does not belong to us. Will D. E. F. say the promise giving the power to perform miracles is addressed to all ministers, but ministers cannot now perform such miraculous acts, therefore the promise has failed? Or ought he not rather to say, ministers cannot now exercise such powers, therefore the promise conferring the power to do so is not addressed to ministers of the present day?

Or will D. E. F. prefer saying the promise does not impart the power of performing miracles? In this case I leave him to argue with the evangelist Mark, who says, in the parallel passage to Matt. xxviii. 20, "They shall cast out devils; they shall speak with tongues," &c. Mark xvi. 17, 18. I shall farther leave him to a discussion with Paul, who, in his epistle to the church at Corinth, says that the testimony of Christ was confirmed in them by the gift of all utterance, and of all knowledge. 1 Cor. i. 5, 6. But certainly the gift of all utterance and of all knowledge could confirm only that testimony mentioned in Matt. xxviii. 20; for there is no other testimony of Christ on this subject, and, moreover, this being called *the* testimony intimates it to be some remarkable testimony. What testimony of Christ could be so remarkable as the very last one he delivered? That the utterance and knowledge of the Corinthian brethren were strictly miraculous, appears from the account of them, and the directions for their use, given in the 12th and a great part of the 13th chapter of the same epistle. As the gifts of utterance and knowledge referred to in the epistle to the Corinthians were miraculous, so were the blessings promised by Christ in the text of Matt. xxviii. 20, for this promise or testimony was confirmed by the miraculous gifts attributed to some brethren at Corinth by the apostle Paul. The gifts then promised in the controverted text were miraculous.

My opponent, in his next paragraph, supposes that my denial of any reference to ministers in the controverted passage, denies also that it is the duty of ministers in the present day to preach the gospel. Is the passage in Matt. xxviii. 19, the only place in the Bible where this duty is commanded? By what imaginable logic could my restriction of the promise so oft alluded to, be made to annihilate more than a hundred places of Scripture where a certain duty is commanded? Could any sound reasoner infer, from my denial of ministers' right to claim an unintelligible presence of Christ with them, a consequent denial of their duty to preach the gospel? Supposing such a duty not to be commanded in this passage, is it therefore unscriptural? I before showed that the duty might be commanded to the apostles in their general character of

ministers, and consequently to all other ministers, whilst yet the different circumstances in which the apostles and other ministers are placed, might require for the apostles the promise of a peculiar presence giving in addition to that infallibility which rendered them able, without the usual prelude of scholastic study to preach the truth, a supernatural power to attest the verity of their doctrines, without an appeal to the authority of confessed revelation. As their ministry was prosecuted principally among the gentiles who knew not the Old Testament Scriptures, and at a time when the New Testament was not yet penned, it is evident that such an infallible presence was needful to them, for by no other means, in the case of New Testament doctrines, could the apostles be secured from error; and it appears, from the history of that time, that the spirit of infallibility concurred with this promise, as, immediately before its reception, we find them doubting of the principal truths of Christianity. Mark xvi. 14; Luke xxiv. 11, 13—31, 37, 41, 45; John xx. 24, 29; Acts i. 6; though from the moment in which they received this promise, they became the infallible foundation on which the church was to be built. Eph. ii. 20. The promise conveyed, therefore, some supernatural power; but as ministers now do not possess this power, the promise does not relate to them.

When D. E. F. somewhat sarcastically asks, in his next paragraph, in relation to my assertion that ministers cannot perform such miracles now, "Can ministers perform miracles of any nature?" he surely forgets that the priests of the apostolic succession do plead for their ability to perform a miracle as great as any recorded in the New Testament, when they insist that the rite of baptism, administered by regularly ordained ministers on unconscious infants, confers the regeneration of the soul; and he must further forget, what he ought surely to have kept in view, that there are certain dissenting ministers, of no succession at all, who claim an equally miraculous privilege, in asserting that what is preached by them, however deficient it may be of truth and theological accuracy, is attended with some mystical presence of Christ higher in degree than that which is the common privilege of all saints; and further, that this presence is equally enjoyed by all ministers, though they may mutually oppose each other in many points of doctrine; and, finally, that this wonderful faculty is, I presume, conferred on them by the ceremony of ordination. Now I do unhesitatingly call this a claim of something very miraculous. Most assuredly I am not conscious of any other presence of my great Master, but of that which confers a sustaining power to preserve me in existence, and of that which imparts a gracious influence to maintain my soul in life. I thankfully acknowledge the power of his word in its adaptation to the moral condition of man: I rejoice to see that he blesses that word to the conversion and salvation of sinners, but I shudder at the thought of connecting any portion of the confused and inconsistent statements which I bring forward in my explications of his holy word, with any presence of my Master, except that of his gracious acceptance of and blessing on my unworthy labours, and of his pardon of my errors. Let D. E. F. plead for the presence of God to bless His

word, and he will not find me an antagonist. That a particular promise may be connected with statements which regard others besides those to whom that promise was primarily directed, appears from Matt. x. 18, 19, 20. Our Lord here teaches his apostles that they should be brought into difficulties on account of their preaching the truth, and grounds on this fact the promise, "But when they deliver you up, take no thought how or what ye shall speak, for it shall be given you in that same hour what ye shall speak. For it is not ye that speak, but the Spirit of your Father which speaketh in you." v. 19, 20. Will D. E. F. say, agreeably with his principles, that ministers, on similar occasions, are not to consider how to defend themselves, but are to trust to immediate inspiration? Or will he say, as he asserts in another place, that, on my principles, ministers are not liable to be brought into similar difficulties? To claim the promise here given, would be to claim the highest kind of inspiration. Thus D. E. F. may see that his dilemma is most easily answered: he might have answered it himself if he had thought fit.

D. E. F. says, in the conclusion of his next paragraph, "Apply the same line of argument (that disproving the supposed presence) to the case of Christians in general, and it will go to prove that there is no longer any promise of salvation." It is really grievous that D. E. F. should venture to utter such unsound expressions under the name of argument. Does he not remember that the promise of the salvation of believers occurs under every possible form of expression in the New Testament, and that, therefore, if the controverted passage and all its parallels were lost from the volume of holy writ, the promise of the salvation of believers would yet remain? Or, because that promise is in one text of Scripture connected with the gift of supernatural powers to some particular individuals, and, through them, to some others who believed by their immediate ministry when obvious reasons may be brought to show the necessity of such powers, does he suppose, that where such extraordinary powers are neither given nor enjoyed, there is no promise of the salvation of believers generally? When D. E. F. asserts that there are numbers who can say, "in their strict grammatical sense," "The Lord stood with me and supported me," &c. he is saying what I do not comprehend, or, if I do comprehend him, permit me to say his words are wholly irrelevant. For, if he mean by *strict grammatical sense*, that the Lord is *really* with them, what is this assertion but what I have pleaded for in the case of all Christians, and not exclusively of ministers? If he mean by *strict grammatical sense*, that the Lord is equally and in the same sense with those gentlemen as he was with the Apostle Paul who primarily used the words, then I venture to pronounce this assertion rash, as equalling their ministerial character with that of an inspired apostle. I am astonished that men of piety, or even of sense, can dare to speak of their fallible and often incorrect ministerial instruction in the same terms as characterise the labours of those who were the subjects of direct inspiration. And yet this is the true assumption of those who claim the promise of Matt. xxviii. 20, and is another proof of the danger of holding confused and mystical views of the meaning of the word of God. If they content themselves with

claiming the gracious presence of the Lord, that I have abundantly granted; but, at the same time, I assert that they must be contented to enjoy this blessing in common with their people, with all the saints of God; and I further assert, that they must lay no claim to the promise of Matt. xxviii. 20, as that promise was intended for some particular ministers, that is, for the apostles, and for them alone. To answer D. E. F.'s query, I confess we are in possession of a blessing, of a blessing promised in many places, but not in that place of Matthew so often referred to, and still less are we in possession of any promise implying what that text assuredly does, the power of working miracles.

When D. E. F. affirms, in his next paragraph, that he could not, on my principles, perceive that any Christian in the present day can accurately prove his title to a single promise in the whole word of God, I can see nothing but an additional exemplification of a fact very observable in the intellectual phenomena of mankind, namely, that a too easy credulity in some points, is often accompanied by an irrational scepticism in others, and that it is no unusual fact in the history of mind, to remove from a belief without evidence, to an incredulity against reason. The mind often atones for a too confident belief by an equally irrational doubt, or rather, believes in one case and disbelieves in the other, from the same inattention to sound reason.

The easy manner in which my annotator dismisses his next paragraph, is admirably descriptive of the state of mind to which reference is made above. He sees no difficulty in limiting the promise! Well then, let him explain how Christ is present with his ministers. He must intelligibly point out some presence of Christ higher than that common to all believers, and lower than that which confers miraculous powers. If D. E. F. does really see no difficulty, it will be easy for him to explain the nature of this presence.

As for my opponent's last argument, that, on the ground maintained by me, the Jewish church had much the advantage of the Christian, I really can see no force in it, nor would my opponent, I suspect, if he had remembered that I gave to the christian church as real a presence short of something miraculous, as any believer in revelation would claim for her predecessor, the spiritual presence of the Lord with all her members. Let my opponent again remember that we are not disputing about the Lord's presence with his church generally, but with his ministers in particular, and let him observe not again to make the word *church*, and the words *ministers of Christ*, convertible. Let him also observe, that I am not opposing God's blessing on his preached word, but simply the application of the promise in Matt. xxviii. 20. to ministers generally, on the ground that the promise in that text confers miraculous powers. My argument goes to prove that the promise in Matt. xxviii. 20, confers no especial presence of Christ on *ministers*; my opponent answers me by saying, that I take from the *church of brighter times the presence of her Great Head*. This I have never done, nor thought of doing. That presence is, indeed, one of my main principles, and I could almost dare to say my opponent must have known that I plainly assert it. If he do not

know it, he is certainly not prepared to answer me, as I believe it is indispensable to a disputant that he understand the principles, the avowed principles, of his antagonist.

Allow me, Mr. Editor, to say that D. E. F. has not deigned to touch, much less to answer, any of the arguments I have adduced in favour of my view, but has contented himself by raising a few objections from the supposed consequences of admitting this view. I have shown, I think clearly, that these objections are not at all to the point, as they are grounded on conclusions not deducible from my theory by sound reasoning. I might here conclude, but, as I cannot but think that my opponent has not fully understood my arguments, I shall add a few more observations to clear away, as much as possible, the obscurity in which, to some minds, the subject is involved.

I shall begin first with a few texts of Scripture, in which the very phrase under debate is used to denote a limited time, a dispensation. "*τί τὸ σημεῖον τῆς συντελείας τοῦ αἰῶνος.*" Matt. xxiv. 3. In this instance the words must imply the end of the Jewish dispensation, as they are part of a question of the disciples inquiring when those things should happen of which Jesus had been speaking. But of what had Jesus been speaking? Truly of the destruction of the Jewish temple. "There shall not be left one stone upon another, that shall not be thrown down." ver. 2. But the temple was destroyed on the destruction of Jerusalem, at the end of the Jewish age: most assuredly that temple is not now in existence, and therefore cannot be destroyed at the end of the world.

In Heb. ix. 26. we read *νῦν δὲ ἀπαξ ἐπὶ συντελείᾳ τῶν αἰώνων—φανέρωται*: but our Lord did not appear at the end of the world, but at the end of the Jewish age. His appearance at the time here spoken of was "to put away sin," but that will not be the reason of his appearance at the end of the world.

We also have in 1 Cor. x. 11. a very similar phrase *ἡμῶν, εἰς ἣς τὰ τελετῶν αἰώνων κατήντησεν.*" But since the time in which this was written, eighteen centuries have expired, and we have no appearance now of the impending end of the world. The apostle's sense is, that he and those to whom he wrote lived at the end of that dispensation in the beginning of which lived the individuals whose evil example he warned them not to follow, intimating that as the rebels of the early period of that dispensation perished on account of sin, so with a still greater reason would they, who sinned in the latter period of Judaism when the nature of that dispensation appeared so much clearer, perish on account of apostacy. Let it be remembered, that in the first two of these cited texts the words are precisely the same as in the text of Matt. xxviii. 20, and that though there be a slight omission in the principal noun, namely, of the conjunction *συν* in the latter instance, yet it is such as causes no difference in the sense, and scarcely any in the form.

By these texts, in addition to those adduced before, it is clear that the words *συντελεία τοῦ αἰῶνος* may, and do often mean the age, the dispensation, or some defined period in the history of the world. I have yet many more instances to be produced in evidence of such a

meaning of the words, but I refrain, not willing to occupy your pages unnecessarily.

I proceed in the next place to prove from the language of scripture, that the apostles did receive the power of working miracles from this promise. It is a principle of biblical criticism, universally received, that a parallel passage is the best comment on a difficult text of God's word. Such parallels, always authoritative so far as the general bearings of the compared passages agree, become, in a case where two evangelists relate the same event, or convey the same command of their Lord to the same persons and at the same time, a mutual interpretation of each other, one explaining or paraphrasing what the other relates in a more succinct manner. Now of this nature precisely are the parallel passages in Matt. xxviii. 19, 20, and Mark xvi. 15—18. This is so evident, that two opinions cannot possibly be entertained. The words therefore, "Lo I am with you always, even to the end of the world," Matt. xxviii. 20. are to be understood in connection with Mark xvi. "And these signs shall follow them that believe; in my name they shall cast out devils; they shall speak with new tongues; they shall take up serpents; and if they drink any deadly thing, it shall not hurt them; they shall lay hands on the sick, and they shall recover." Now if these things are to follow in the case of all believers, in the case of those who believe through the instrumentality of ministers in the present day, then, to borrow an argument from D. E. F. himself, there is not a believer in the world. But D. E. F. would abhor such an assertion; let him therefore beware of the principle from which it is deduced.

That this promise was absolutely fulfilled in the apostles' case, Mark gives you his own authority, by a comment on these words which immediately follows, "And they went forth—the Lord working with them, and confirming the work with signs following," 20.—and Paul, in his epistle to the Hebrews, connecting the apostolical ministry with that of our Lord, says, "How shall we escape if we neglect so great salvation, which at the first began to be spoken by the Lord, and was confirmed unto us by them that heard him; God always bearing them witness, both with signs and wonders, and with divers miracles, and with gifts of the Holy Ghost, according to his own will?" Heb. ii. 3, 4: and to render this proof complete, the apostle subjoins some words which exactly describe the nature of that miraculous agency which Christ himself employed, and which he enabled his apostles to employ in establishing his dispensation. "For unto the angels he hath not put into subjection the world to come." 5. Now this assertion of Paul, Heb. ii. 3, 4, illustrates the history of the apostles from the moment they first received this promise. This promise, conveying infallibility and divine power to the apostles, accounts for the extraordinary fact, that though on the very same day, and in the very moment before the promise was delivered, their Master "upbraided their unbelief and hardness of heart, because they believed not" (i. e. his resurrection), Mark xvi. 14, yet from that moment we behold them proceeding in their work with a confidence and boldness altogether supernatural. What can account for this amazing difference but the fact that this promise

conveyed to them some miraculous power? I have already mentioned the apostle's language, 1 Cor. i. 5, 6. as a proof that miraculous powers are conveyed by this promise, and I wonder how my antagonist could omit this argument, and not even attempt to show any other testimony of Christ but that promise in Matt. xxviii. 20, which was confirmed by the reception, in the case of the Corinthian brethren, of the gifts of all utterance and all knowledge. I have also referred to the fact, that even after the believers in Samaria had been baptized, the apostles Peter and John journeyed to that city purposely to impart to the baptized those miraculous gifts which they alone could give. Acts viii. 14—19.

I suppose then, and am borne out in my supposition by what I have heard from many with whom I have disputed on this subject, that the apostles did receive this particular power in virtue of this promise. But my opponents proceed to say, that ministers in the present day do not claim or expect any such power, though this promise belongs to them. Let such gentlemen observe, that this verse, according to their views, imparts some promise, whatever that promise may mean, unto ministers to the end of the world. If the promise respected miraculous powers, these ministers have such a power. Will D. E. F. then argue, "that this promise of the gospel has failed?" or will he not more modestly say, "the promise was intended for the apostles alone."

If D. E. F. will yet claim this promise, I shall ask him what does it confer? It is confessed that it does not enable ministers to perform miracles—that it does not insure infallibility. It is manifest that the individuals for whom it is claimed vary much from each other on points of doctrine. Those ministers in their pulpit labours do not always agree with truth, with each other, or with themselves. I apprehend these gentlemen are painfully aware that they have, in the course of their ministry, advanced many propositions inconsistent with the real meaning of God's word. Were they then equally in the enjoyment of this promise of Christ as at the present time? The view of this promise entertained by my opponent forbids any increase of knowledge or religious truth, any more enlarged or more rational and scriptural views of doctrine than those enjoyed at the first period of any individual's ministry. It can only be a correlate with infallibility.

It appears to me an unspeakable evil that good men will claim a promise to which they attach no clear intelligible ideas, a promise which, in their sense, imparts nothing, effects nothing, which cannot be explained, and respecting which no two persons agree. Verily some men appear to love mystery so much, that except the glorious principles of the gospel be invested with it, those principles lose much of their interest. D. E. F. asserts that he should shrink from the work of the gospel ministry if he could be induced to believe my views on this subject. Am I to understand that the belief of the truth, the ability of preaching it, the adaptation of truth to the moral capabilities of our fellow men, and above all, the power which God has given to his truth to influence the soul, afford not abundant encouragement to animate the ministers of the gospel in their great

work? They afford sufficient encouragement to me. I lament from my heart the tendency which I perceive in some minds to clothe those principles which can appeal only to the mind, with a vestment which may impose on the senses. I fear that the strong hold which such views have on their affections, derives much of its tenacity from the dignity supposed to be imparted by them. Popery, in some shape or other, is the religion most natural to us all. It exists in a dissenting meeting-house as really as in the gentlemen at Rome, and with this difference principally, that at Rome it is at home, but with us it is contemptible—the priest is in our conventicles a poor little imitator,—they do these things, at least consistently, at Rome.

I proceed, in the last place, to prove, that if this promise belong to ministers in any sense, it assuredly belongs to the papists, and that consequently protestant ministers holding the view of D. E. F. are precluded from any capability of pleading this promise. If this promise belong to any minister besides the apostles, it must belong to those who succeed the apostles, for in no other sense can this promise have any relation to persons absent at the time of its first communication, whilst it is addressed to certain persons under the term *you*, excepting those absent individuals could, by an usual fiction, be included under that pronoun by participating in the official character of the persons primarily addressed. They must have succeeded the apostles. Then the promise must proceed in a right line to their successors, that is, unquestionably to the pope and his ministers. If the promise be really theirs, then we can have no right to it, for God's presence cannot be equally with them who oppose each other on material points of doctrine. The pope then, having this promise by right of succession, gives his determination plainly, and I confess I see only the following objection which we could bring against his claim. We might ask him to prove his right to this promise by exercising that miraculous power which the apostles possessed in consequence of its being addressed to them. But to this the papist would reply by saying, that we protestants do not make this power necessary to the verification of our claim, and so could not fairly urge this as a difficulty to the adversary; and if pressed farther on this subject, he would boldly, as he actually does, lay claim to the ability to perform such miraculous acts.

Nor will it be permitted to D. E. F. to answer the papist by saying that this promised presence is the privilege of those only who preach the same doctrines as the apostles, because in thus saying he departs from his first principle. His principle requires that they who succeed the apostles enjoy that promise—and the text gives this privilege, without limitation, without qualification as to what is preached, which is a distinct proof that the promise was intended only for inspired, infallible men, preserved from error by direct inspiration. The pronoun *you* can in no rational manner be applied to absent persons, excepting that in an official capacity they do really occupy the same ground as that on which the first recipients stood. In quitting this principle, and substituting that of agreement with the apostle's doctrine, my adversary does in fact forsake his original ground, and though I do heartily and thankfully acknowledge that the gentle-

men whom I know to hold the controverted view of Matt. xxviii. 20, can amply prove the general verity of what they deliver in their ministerial capacity, yet I beg to affirm that this way of claiming the promised presence is totally opposed in principle to the opinion of D. E. F., namely, that in consequence of the language of Matt. xxviii. 26, being addressed to the apostles and succeeding ministers that promise is enjoyed.

I refrain from adding more. I have the highest respect and love for all my faithful brethren, and I would particularise my opponents T. K. and D. E. F. May the Spirit of truth make us all wiser and holier.

THE REVIEWER OF FABER.

ON THE TRUST-DEEDS OF CONGREGATIONAL PLACES OF WORSHIP.

SIR,—I HAVE carefully perused the article which appeared in the Eclectic Review, on trust-deeds, and the correspondence which it has called forth in your Magazine, and beg to trouble you with a few observations on the subject. I cannot agree with your correspondent W., that we ought to give “to religious communities, in every deed of trust, the power of modification *to any extent*, to be exercised by the members for the time being;” nor with your correspondent S. R., “that a deed constructed on congregational principles ought not to go a step further than to secure the use of the chapel to the church assembling therein;”—because such deeds afford no security against the perversion of the property of evangelical Christians to the propagation of dangerous error, and even blasphemy itself. Instances of such effects have been of frequent occurrence, and even, not many years ago, a chapel in South Wales, which had been erected for the use of evangelical dissenters, and which had been occupied by them for nearly a century, was diverted from its original purpose to the use of a portion of the congregation who adopted Unitarian sentiments.

Now, Sir, it does seem to me that we are bound to provide against such injurious consequences. The property given by Christians in one generation for the propagation of truth does not, of right, become the property of any *individuals* of a future generation, unless they carry out the objects of the donors; and this principle, I submit, is “founded alike on essential equity and religious expediency.” The arguments of W. and S. R., if carried out to their fullest extent, would leave chapels entirely at the disposal of the majority of the occupants for the time being, provided they call themselves “the church assembling therein,” even if they should maintain Unitarian, Socialist, or Chartist views, all of which parties form what they call churches. Surely, this cannot be right. Such parties ought not, under any circumstances, to acquire a right of occupancy. I am far from contending for those trust-deeds which “perpetuate secta-

rianism and lamentable divisions in the church of God," but it appears to me, Sir, that in all our trust-deeds, *we ought to require that the ministers for the time being should hold and maintain those grand doctrinal truths on which our hopes of salvation are exclusively founded*; whilst the members of the church for the time being should have full power to determine all other matters. In modern deeds which have come under my own notice, this principle appears almost to be carried out. They, certainly, mention the denomination for whose use the chapels are erected, and require that the *pastors* should be of the evangelical sentiments which they express, but the management of all its own affairs is left to each church, and there is a clause allowing other Christians to be admitted to communion who are not of the Independent or Congregational denomination. In these deeds, therefore, although they might be much improved, there appears to me nothing to prevent that general union of evangelical Christians which is so much to be desired.

I remain, Sir,

Your's respectfully,

R. H.

Bath, October 3, 1839.

FURTHER REMARKS ON TRUST-DEEDS.

(To the Editor.)

SIR,—WHERE reasoning involves important consequences, it should be rigidly scrutinized; and I perfectly agree with your correspondent, Mr. S. R. Brynmair, that whether "Wesleyans have *more* to lose than Congregationalists have, can in no way affect the principle under consideration,"—the principle assumed, (I presume,) that Dissenters are fettered in their theology, by their trust-deeds, *as* the friends of establishments are fettered in theirs by the state endowment. But you will allow me to inform Mr. S. R. B. that he mistakes in attributing to *me* any remark or reference whatever to the Wesleyans. The remark he refers to was made in an appendix to my letter, and for which appendix I am not responsible. So far from agreeing with that remark, I should say that the Wesleyans *might*, with justice, as strongly deny being fettered in their theology *by their corporate property*, as I have denied such restriction to exist with respect to Dissenters generally. No one can be said to be fettered by that which he can rid himself of when he pleases. He may be put to a great trial to part with golden chains, but if he finds himself in chains, and voluntarily wears them, it is not by them but by his own will that he is fettered. If any *Dissenters* are fettered in their theology, it is not by their trust-deeds, but by their preference of gain to godliness. The comparison of Mr. Morrison, on which the Eclectic Reviewer discoursed, was between the *conditions* of those who hold the principle of an establishment and those who do not. But the case has been argued as if the comparison were between the conditions of those who say "We claim public funds for the maintenance of

religion," and a second party, who are assumed to say, "We claim such a meeting-house or endowment." The whole alarm, therefore, raised by the Reviewer, and re-echoed by your correspondents, is founded upon the wrong assumption that Dissenters bind themselves to keep their chapels or endowments, at all events, as the friends of an establishment bind *themselves*, (as they necessarily do,) at all events, to receive public funds.

So long as the Dissenter *will* have his chapel or endowment, after he dislikes the conditions upon which he holds it, his theology is, of course, fettered; but he is not *obliged* to have it. But the contender for an establishment *must* have a state-endowment, and therefore *cannot but* be fettered in his theology by it, when he disapproves the enjoined discipline or creed. He *will* have the state money; he *must* have the state creed. When the Dissenter says to the friends of the establishment, "you are pledged upon your principle to have a state-endowment, and must therefore have the creed it is tied to;" they cannot rejoin, "and you are pledged to keep *your* endowment, and are therefore enthralled by the terms of your trust-deeds." It is no such thing. The Dissenter may disenthral himself as soon as he feels his trust-deed to be irksome. But the contender for an establishment, as such, *cannot* get free. The moment he says, I will follow the Bible, come what will, he has given up his principle of—I claim the provision of the state—and is a Dissenter; and the comparison instituted by Mr. Morrison is at an end, and all argument with it.

But now, to come to the matter of *real and practical* importance to Dissenters, it appears to me that both your correspondents, W. and Mr. Brynmair, have adopted false positions; and I trust Dissenters will beware, lest zeal for liberty beguile them into unfaithfulness to the truth or presumptuous neglect of prudential measures. I adhere most entirely to the opinion expressed in my first letter, that, (contrary to the opinion of W.) we ought to dispose of our property, in the prospect of death or otherwise, according to *our own* convictions, and not according to what may be the convictions of those living a hundred years hence. If it is our conviction that we had better leave our property absolutely, well and good; but if we think it had better not be left absolutely, why, the property being *now* our own, should we dispose of it in any way that *we* think would not be right? The principle of W., I submit, would discourage benevolence, by rendering its desired exercises uncertain of realization. Besides, if we may not equitably controul the future use of our property by testamentary provisions, as W. contends, it is wrong to make a will at all. If, because I have only "a life-enjoyment" of my property, I may not leave it to W. upon certain conditions to be fulfilled by him, I have no right to leave it to him absolutely; for I do no less controul its disposal beyond the period of my "life-enjoyment," if I say it shall go to W. after my decease, than if I say it shall go to W. *upon certain conditions*, after my decease. The *principle* of W., consequently, is *proved* to be a fallacy; for to say that we may not make a will, (which his principle *does* say,) is to contradict reason and scripture in so many obvious points, that the contradiction must be evident to every one. It is quite clear then that we may equitably arrange, (so the

apostle thought,) what shall be done *after our decease*; and that if I leave property to persons of such or such opinions, I do not lay any embargo upon the property of A. or B. It never was *their* property absolutely, or except conditionally—it was theirs only *to the extent of occupancy*.

Mr. Brynmair says, “It appears to me that a deed constructed on Congregational principles ought not to go a step further than to secure the use of the chapel to the church assembling therein.” *What church?* This must be stated in the deed, or the deed means nothing. If the property is left to the church as *its* property, it may be personally applied, and the end of the testator be entirely defeated. If its property only for certain uses, and under certain conditions, the thing is done which W. says is “an illegitimate use of law in a testator;” for *it deprives successors of the power of a proprietor*. It matters not how few and simple the conditions, the “illegitimate” thing, according to W., is done. Yet W. himself admits that “chapels ought to be built; and, being built, they ought to be secured to those who, after we are gone, will ‘worship in our room.’” The question, then, after all this discussion, is only of *more or less*; and any thing said by either of your correspondents against the *principle* of “embodying the articles of our belief in the trust-deeds of our chapels,” comes to nothing, and such embodying does *not* “unnecessarily fetter our theology,” and is *not* done “in direct violation of our fundamental principles as Congregational Dissenters;” but is perfectly compatible with them, the contrary supposing a denial of the right to arrange what shall be done with our property, after our decease, altogether, which is an absurdity. As I said in my first letter, trust-deeds should not needlessly embarrass; but when Mr. Brynmair says, “Ought not a Unitarian congregation to be empowered to convert their Unitarian meeting-house into a Trinitarian meeting-house, if they choose?” I answer, certainly; *their* Unitarian meeting-house, but not a Unitarian meeting-house which is *not* their’s, and the conditional use of which *only* is their’s.

Mr. Brynmair inquires—“How can it be said that Congregational churches are allowed to determine their internal arrangements by a suffrage free from all foreign interference, if they be not allowed to use their chapels as they please?” I answer, Mr. B. assumes what is not the fact; viz. that Congregational churches are *not* allowed to use their chapels as they please. But they *are* allowed to use their chapels as they please, *to the full extent that they are THEIR’S*. Mr. B.’s inquiry assumes for them a right *beyond* their right. Mr. Brynmair says, “Why should the conflicting provisions of antiquated trust-deeds be left as eternal stumbling blocks on the pleasant paths of benevolence and truth?” I ask, in reply, why should the vague provisions of indefinite trust-deeds be left as eternal inlets for the incursions of fraud and error upon the pleasant paths of benevolence and truth? Mr. Brynmair says, “no man, or body of men, should have the power of immortalizing an erroneous creed, or a defective formulary, by any kind of bequest. Truth is of greater value than either monies, lands, or buildings.” I rejoin, no man, or body of men, should have the power of perverting my bequests, so long as “the

legislature, acting for the general good," do not "make a new disposition;" (as W. has it)—no one should be prevented from giving such perpetuity to his opinions as he *can* give them, upon the mere ground that property may be lost to a certain congregation if he do so. *Truth is of more value than monies, lands, or buildings.*

I trust, Sir, those who have property to bequeath, and those who have trust-deeds to prepare, will not be misled by the reasonings which I have opposed. Let us not be moved from our "old ways" as to *principle*. If we can avoid what has proved evil in former trust-deeds, let us do so: but let us not, under the notion of trusting Providence, express by our acts want of confidence in the truth of our creed; or if we *have* a creed, indifference to the faith for which we are enjoined earnestly to contend. If clauses permitting *modification* are introduced, let us take care that they are not permissions to destroy. My candid opinion is, that the censors of our trust-deeds,—I say it pleasantly, and not wishing to offend,—have done little more than to find "a mare's nest." The Eclectic Reviewer is not subject to this remark, since he expressly disavowed censure, and only inquired whether our practice, as Congregational Dissenters, corresponded with our professions. I think it does as to *principle*; and I am wholly unable to see how trust-deeds are opposed, in their *principle*, to christian unity. While any persons honestly hold the opinions of those who conditionally gave the property, the intentions of the giver should be respected; and it would be a bad unity that resulted from any procedure frustrating those intentions, for such a procedure would be a treachery to the dead, and a discouragement to the living.

I am, Sir, your's respectfully,
E. S.

October 5, 1839.

N.B. It would be well if those who think chapel trust-deeds might be better constructed, would *distinctly*, and by example, point out the better way. Let them submit an improved draught for the consideration of our body, that their views may be clearly understood.

ON THE PRESENT TACTICS OF HIGH CHURCH WRITERS.

THE leaders in the ecclesiastical warfare of the present day, avail themselves of a *tactique* of which, upon every ground, I must disapprove. The person of the arguer, rather than the point of his argument, is the object of attack; and the drapery of his style, the curtain-work of his batteries, (if the play of figure be allowed,) is demolished with relentless ridicule, while his actual defences, redoubt, and bastion of fact and inference, are left unassailed. Any foible of any writer, any *trait* of his character or incident of his life, which may come to the knowledge of a reviewer or a journalist, is dragged in, head and shoulders, upon the stage of notoriety, made the subject of impertinent and unfriendly remark, and mixed up with the merits of a question to which such purely personal matters are altogether foreign. Against this literary eaves-dropping I beg leave to enter my

protest, and to deplore, while I condemn it. It is, I fear, but the natural offspring of that truculent spirit of party which is riding rampant through our social world, and proclaiming "war to the knife" against all who "follow not with us;" a sign too, I apprehend, that we are fallen upon those last degenerate days, one of whose predicted features is, that "the love of many shall wax cold."

The immediate occasion of these remarks will be found in one of the monthly publications, whose high church propensities are notorious, and in the August number of which, under the pretence of literary criticism, is poured forth a farrago of abuse against some persons whose principal fault, in the eyes of the reviewer, evidently was, that they were dissenting ministers. With the decision of the reviewer upon their respective merits I will not meddle. One of the castigated may write prefaces "which would immortalize a pig," and tag verses that "would drive the muses mad;" he may neither possess the *æstrum* nor the knack of poesy. The other person who has fallen under the lash, may be consigned to the asylum of the incurables, who "*quo magis senescunt, eo magis stultescunt*;" but "what on earth," we ask, have these "or any such like sovereign buffoons, to do with the transactions of" the Society for the Suppression of Cruelty to Animals, or the questions now at issue between Churchmen and Dissenters? I would offer no observation in bar of conviction or in mitigation of sentence of these literary culprits, if the writ and the finding be based upon literary grounds. We trust we have too much self-respect to advance at the *pas de charge* in a career of literary Quixotism, the avowed defenders of the drivellings of idiocy or the aberrations of eccentricity, against the *dummies* or the doughties of periodical criticism, because these vagaries may have been perpetrated under the very comprehensive name of dissent. No. We leave the parties reflected on to their fate—the unfledged or the oft-plucked *litterateurs* of voluntarism, if so it please "the cunningge man" of the review to dub them—but must deprecate this unhandsome trick of fence, whereby fair play is outraged, the craft critic degraded, and the malice of party gratified at the expense of the interests of truth.

The object, however, of these "modern instances," and of a thousand others of which these are only a sample, is clearly this—to prejudice the cause of nonconformity in the public mind, by leaving the impression that all its ministers are ignorant, silly enough to blazon their ignorance on letter-press, and excessively imprudent in the conduct of life.

Against such an impression we must reclaim; and against the ungenerous, unjust, and illogical process by which it is sought to be made:

Illogical; for we have not yet forgotten the rule of our college compendium, "*Non valere argumentum a particulari ad universale*."

Unjust, because there are persons before the world, though we name them not, as historians, mathematicians, classics, legislators, and divines, belonging to the various denominations of Dissenters, of whom, in sooth, any religions body might be proud. And lastly, it is

Ungenerous, to taunt us with our ignorance, even if the conclusion

insinuated in the articles referred to were true of all, as it is confessedly of some. Have not the portals of our national seminaries been closed against the admission of Dissenters with the pertinacity of intolerance and the rancour of hate? And is it not the boast of some, certainly not the most enlightened of their party, that nonconformists have "neither part nor lot" in the universities of the land? Excluded then as we are from any corporate share in the great commonwealth of learning, and constrained to pick up our literary nutriment when and where we may, sensibly feeling, moreover, and candidly confessing our disadvantages in this respect, we think it ungenerous in the extreme in those who appropriate "the feast of fat things" to themselves, to point the finger of scorn at the victims of an unwilling famine, and raise the cry, "Your leanness, your leanness!"

D. O. T. A.

ORIGINAL LETTER OF THE REV. DR. DODDRIDGE, ADDRESSED TO THE REV. MR. JACOB CHAPMAN, STAPLEHURST, KENT.

Northampton, Dec. 24, 1747.

MY DEAR AND WORTHY FRIEND,

Your last letter was very welcome to me, though it threw me into a little confusion that I had not answered your former. Accept my thanks for both, and my faithful assurances of the most respectful and affectionate friendship; I am greatly concerned to hear of your late dangerous illness, and heartily join with you in acknowledging the divine goodness in your recovery. I can truly say I know few like minded, few by whose intimate conversation and daily example I should improve more. The affectionate zeal you express for spreading "The Rise and Progress of Religion," cannot but very sensibly oblige me. I desire to commit the success of the kind scheme you have formed, and every thing else relating to my reputation and usefulness, to the divine direction, truly sensible how little anything of mine deserves the care and regard of the world as such; but I bless God this treatise has been made useful, and I have lately received intelligence of one instance in which there is reason to hope it has been owned for the conversion of a gentleman of very good sense, who had quite outgrown the influences of a good education, and was standing on the verge of infidelity, if not actually plunged into it, but is now become a cordial believer of the gospel, in consequence of what he felt in the perusal of this treatise; a remarkable proof that the irregularity of the heart, rather than of the head, lies at the root of infidelity. I am glad the Colonel's memoirs are so acceptable to you; I have been severely fallen upon in Scotland for some passages in it, which I am sure were very well meant, and a scandalous libel has been written on that occasion, but I really think it below my notice, any further than to pray for the unhappy man who was capable of showing such a spirit on such an occasion. I am glad to hear there is another edition of "The Call and Directions" demanded. I do not exactly know what I am indebted to you for those I had last, and the five upon "Infant Bap-

tism" which came with them, and which I hope have been of service, but I beg the favour of you to call upon Mr. Jackson when you are in town, and let him know the amount of the whole, and he will pay you on the credit of this letter, if he does not know you, and if he does, I am sure you need no credentials. I shall undoubtedly want some more of these excellent books, which I hope God has signally blest in some places. You are entirely welcome to make any extracts from any of my writings that you please, and indeed, I have not the shadow of an objection against it, unless it be the undeserved honour that such extracts do me. I hope, my dear friend, that God succeeds your ministry; I hope he has made the late visitation comfortable to your soul. I do indeed remember you when God gives me any particular degree of nearness to himself, and you are among the number of those friends whom I most particularly mention before the throne of grace. It always gives me pleasure to hear from you, and I trust they are everlasting bonds, in which

I am, dear Sir,

Your affectionate Brother and faithful Friend and Servant,

P. DODDRIDGE.

I have just received a most comfortable account of the success of the gospel among the Indians in New Jersey and thereabouts. It is now in MS. but will, I hope, soon be printed.

A HARVEST HYMN, IN A WET SEASON.

BY JAMES MONTGOMERY, ESQ.

We lift our eyes, our hearts to Thee;
Our knees, our souls, to Thee we bend;
Father of all earth's family,
The appointed weeks of harvest send.

The ground, Thy table, is full spread
With food to nourish man and beast;
Hast Thou prepar'd the children's bread,
And wilt Thou now forbid the feast?

Summer and winter, day and night,
Seed-time and harvest, Thou hast will'd;
And dew, and rain, and warmth, and light,
Have each their gracious task fulfill'd,

Shall whelming floods the hopes destroy
Of those who in Thy promise trust?
Shall storms prevent the reaper's joy,
And lay his confidence in dust?

O bid the winds and waters cease,
The lowering firmament unshroud;
Think on Thy covenant of peace,
Look on Thy bow,—'tis on the cloud.

We fall adoring at Thy feet;
Our prayer is heard, the veil is riven;
With deep thanksgiving let us eat
The bread that cometh down from heaven.

Sheffield, Sept. 1, 1839.

REVIEW.

CIVIL ESTABLISHMENTS OF RELIGION.

- I. *Lectures on the Establishment and Extension of National Churches.* By Thomas Chalmers, D.D. 1838. 8vo. Hamilton and Adams.
- II. *National Church Establishments examined.* By Ralph Wardlaw, D.D. 1839. 8vo. Jackson and Walford.
- III. *The Voluntary System; a Prize Essay in answer to the Lectures of Dr. Chalmers on Church Establishments.* By Joseph Angus, M.A. 1839. Royal 12mo. Jackson and Walford.
- IV. *The British Critic and Quarterly Theological Review*, No. 51. July, 1839. Article, "Dr. Chalmers' Lectures on Establishments." 8vo. Rivington and Co.
- V. *Series of Tracts on the Intrusion of Ministers on reclaiming Congregations.* 1839. 8vo. Johnstone, Edinburgh.

WE believe the emancipation of religion from its alliance with the world to be a work of God. Under this conviction, we not only have a firm confidence that God will bless his own work, but looking to the analogy of his dealings with mankind from the creation, down to the present moment, we fully expect that the result will be brought about by unthought of instrumentalities. The fall of the first national establishment of religion, without the substitution of another in its place, will, to our mind, and in the estimation of all voluntary churchmen, be the greatest event that has occurred in the church of Christ since the last apostle died, and the age of miracles and of inspiration ceased. Now all great events bearing upon the interests of the people of God, have ever been produced in the manner we have anticipated. Who would have expected a great and mighty nation to be established in Canaan, by means of one family going down into Egypt, and remaining there as slaves till God brought them, a numerous people, into their promised inheritance? Who would have expected, who *did* expect, that the Saviour of the world should be born of humble parents, and die an ignominious death? Who would have anticipated that the way would be paved for bringing in the Gentiles, by the rejection of the original people of God? And why were these things so? Because God's thoughts are not as our thoughts, or his ways as our ways. We are, therefore, fully prepared to witness the consummation of his gracious purposes in the purification of his kingdom, by means such as man would never have devised, but the conduciveness of which, to their appointed end, will be seen immediately on their employment. It is in this view of the subject that it strikes us as exceedingly remarkable, that a man of great abilities, of deserved popularity, and of unquestioned integrity,

should have been raised up within one of our national establishments, and should have acquired extensive influence within the other, who is producing results tending directly to the separation of church and state, such as no individual without the pale of the established church could, by possibility, have effected. Voluntary churchmen have been looking, for years, to the ultimate success of measures and of arguments plied from without, but God has seen fit that the first ray of hope should dawn upon us from within. If that highly respected man, Dr. Chalmers, had even done nothing more than deliver his series of lectures in London, we should have regarded it as a very striking circumstance that the advocates of establishments should have been led to moot the theoretical question of the propriety of such institutions, before the opposite theory had been mooted with equal publicity in the metropolis. Such a course was not the course which cool calculation would have dictated as the most prudent policy for the defenders of an existing system to adopt. It would have been wiser, in the sense of worldly wisdom, to have met partial and detailed assaults by corresponding lines of defence, and not to have raised the general question, not to have brought the whole garrison into the field, until a general attack was made by the assailants. Such a course, we say, would have been more politic; and it is remarkable, that a numerous society of intelligent churchmen (as we believe the Christian Influence Society to be) should have failed to perceive beforehand the probable effect of their originating such a discussion, and should have succeeded in procuring the services of a man of such singleness of vision, and such resoluteness of character, as to overlook considerations which would have suggested themselves to a more cautious partizan. It must now, we think, be clear to Dr. Chalmers, and to those who concur in his sentiments, as it has from the first been evident to the high-church party in England, as well as to voluntary-churchmen, that a great advantage was conceded to the latter class, when the friends of the establishment raised the question of its expediency. It at once removed the subject out of the category of questions, which the great majority of the community were unprepared to listen to, into the category of questions which the church wished every person to examine for himself. It bespoke attention to the opposite arguments. A spirit of fairness, not to say a feeling of curiosity, would lead those who had attended Dr. Chalmers, to read, if not to hear, Dr. Wardlaw in the following year.

But if it was singular that these considerations should not have been adverted to, it was not less so that a Scotch Presbyterian should have been invited to defend an episcopal church, and this at a moment when transcendental* opinions were acquiring increased influence within that body. It was not possible that he should otherwise than repudiate those views. He did so, and has thereby given great offence to the parties entertaining them, and rendered it nearly impossible that they should ever hereafter combine with the Evangelical and Erastian parties (who were his principal hearers and supporters in England) in any defensive proceedings. The British Critic has con-

* Chalmers, p. 178.

demned Dr. Chalmers's argument with greater vehemence than the Christian Observer has applauded it.

But the most remarkable feature of all, in connection with these lectures is, that the distinguished clergyman who delivered them, and with whom the evangelical party in England has, to a certain degree, identified itself, has, in a more public and decided manner than heretofore, taken ground within the last few weeks in Scotland, in the contest between the Kirk and the Court of Session, which, if adhered to, must inevitably and at once separate church and state in that country. Dr. Chalmers's argument in his lectures, in answer to those who assert that contamination necessarily follows from the union of the church with the state was, that this would be perfectly true if the church must necessarily be dependent of the state; but that this is not an inevitable consequence of an establishment. Consistently with this argument, he has proclaimed in his speech before the General Assembly in May last, in their celebrated debate on the Auchteraunder case, and in the last of the "Series Tracts" published by ministers and laymen of the kirk, (the title of which will be found at the head of this article,) that the church demands independence of the state in the following essential particulars. She demands that the communicants shall have the veto on the appointment of their pastor, (which would virtually give them the choice), and that she shall not be compelled to receive as communicants, mere moral men, whom she believes to be unconverted; Tract xi. p. 6. This truly scriptural ground has not been taken, we believe, with a distinct perception of the consequences which it involves; but it has been taken gradually and deliberately, and with the ardour of men who felt sure that they had the mind of Christ, and who were prepared to imitate the example of their forefathers, the covenanters, in contending for the faith once delivered to the saints. We are convinced, from extensive enquiry among members and clergymen of the kirk, that the leading men in the church will abide by their principles, whatever be the consequences. Some of these are imminent. There are two parishes in which the Presbyteries have refused to induct the patron's nominee, and in one of them they have ordained a minister in opposition to the patron. The House of Lords have confirmed the decision of the Court of Session that the Presbyteries have acted illegally, the veto act of the General Assembly being *ultra vires* of that body. The next step will probably be, that the members of one Presbytery will be sued for damages by the Presentee, for depriving him of his legal rights, and it is not improbable that the members of the other presbytery will be imprisoned for contumacy, if they persevere in disobeying the mandate of the civil court. That court will defend vested interests. It remains to be seen how far the majority which carried the Veto Act in the Assembly, will stand by their brethren in their extremity. We feel convinced that Parliament can never alter the law, as it is now sought to be altered by the Kirk. The House of Commons, much less the House of Lords, will never consent to deprive patrons of their patrimonial rights without compensation. Such a proceeding would subvert the foundations of all property. If tithes shall ever be applied to educational or other state purposes, we hope and believe that the first

step will be to satisfy the vested interests of the owners of advowsons. And who do the Assembly, in their application to Parliament, propose shall become the virtual patrons? The communicants. Now, what was the pervading principle of the repeal of the Test and Corporation Acts? That the Lord's Supper should cease to be a stepping-stone to civil privileges. And is not patronage, or a share in patronage, even though it be only virtual, and not direct—is not this a privilege? is it not property? On what other principle do the civil courts take cognizance of the rights of patrons, than that patronage is property? Surely a Whig government can never consent to its being proclaimed to the Scotch people, that every one who can persuade his minister to admit him to communion, shall have a voice in the appointment of his successor! Independently of the unsound principle involved, it is evident that such a law would put the immediate patronage into the hands of the clergy, not to mention the ultimate remedy which it is intended to place in the hands of the presbytery, who, if the patron and people do not come to an agreement within six months after a vacancy, are to possess the uncontrolled right of appointment! How, again, can Parliament make the communicants the patrons in Scotland, unless it is prepared to pursue the same course in England? There are leading clergymen in England who would be glad that the example should be followed, and the evangelical party (those who are uninfected with Oxford views,) would, to a great extent, fall in with the policy sanctioned by Dr. Chalmers. It would be fruitless to say, that the proposed measure is part of the constitution of the Kirk, and is inapplicable to England. If it were the law of the established Church of Scotland, the General Assembly would not have applied to Parliament to legislate on the subject. The Assembly being witness, the Veto is not yet the law of the land; and if it ought to be made the law of Scotland, by parity of reasoning, and on the same scriptural grounds, the Imperial Parliament ought to make it the law of England. There is no escaping from this inference.

We say, then, that the Veto will never be legalized. But Dr. Chalmers and his party have proclaimed that less than a veto the "christian people of Scotland" cannot and ought not to have. Between the two authorities, the civil and the religious, the sound exposition of constitutional law by the one, and the equally sound exposition of the law of Jesus Christ by the other, we shall, then, have two propositions, containing all the truth that voluntary churchmen have ever contended for, and forming, with their conclusion, as clearly reasoned a syllogism as any logician could require.

The Kirk asserts, That a popular veto is essential to a christian church.

The state adds, That a popular veto is incompatible with an establishment.

If the premises are true, the conclusion follows, (Dr. Pusey, if he were examiner in logic, could not deny it)—

That one element which is essential to a christian church, is incompatible with an establishment!

The strongest voluntary could not desire a conclusion more satisfactory to himself than every christian statesman must arrive at, if his

theology be that of Dr. Chalmers, and his law that of Lord President Hope, Lord Brougham, the Lord Chancellor, and the great majority of the Scotch and English bars. It is remarkable, as we have already observed, that such a conclusion should have been precipitated by the most distinguished modern advocate of establishments.

Dr. Chalmers's Lectures are thus introduced to the readers of the *British Critic*, an organ of the rapidly increasing section of the English church which holds the Oxford views.

"It is above a year since the newspapers informed us that the cause of national Establishments was deriving a great accession of strength from the Lectures delivered by Dr. Chalmers in London. For some days he divided the attention of the London world with the Zoological Gardens and Exeter Hall; and after the requisite number of pirated copies had been circulated and disclaimed during their delivery, Messrs. Hamilton and Adams extended the benefit of his lucubrations to the more rustic parts of our land. All this, if it were allowed to pass away with the other amusements of a London spring, might be well enough. A London May without its excitements would resemble, we presume, one in the country without leaves and flowers; and we have no right to deprive the citizens of their spring. But when we see a disposition in the minds of many professed Churchmen to adopt the argument of these Lectures as their vantage-ground in defending the English Church, it becomes our duty to inquire into the fitness and wisdom of such a course."—p. 228.

We should not have prefaced our own comments on the same publication with a passage the flippancy of which we hold to be unworthy of so serious a subject, were it not to show, that we do not stand alone in our opinion that Dr. Chalmers has descended from the only vantage-ground from which establishments can be defended—the high ground of superstition. This writer exposes, in a contemptuous style, which we certainly shall not imitate, the inconclusiveness of most of the lecturer's arguments. He ridicules Dr. Chalmers's solemn enunciation of irrelevant truisms, and proves that his favourite theory of an original compact between the state and the church—the state employing the purchased agency of ecclesiastics for the utilitarian object of moralizing the community—is as contrary to historical fact, as the notion of the church entering into the "service" of the state, and yet retaining its scriptural independence, is contrary to common sense. On this last point—the church's independence—we cordially re-echo the reviewer's indignant sentiment. "If any church be taken into the service of the state, she has become false to her Lord; she is no true servant of Christ, she is married to another." We need not say, however, that by "the church" we understand a very different society from that sacerdotal organization which the writer contemplates.

It would be out of place, in an article like the present, to offer to our readers a full analysis of the contents of the lectures of Dr. Chalmers. The following are the principal heads of argument. The opponents of establishments are represented as entertaining the opinion, that human agency in the extension of the gospel, is superseded by the acknowledged principle, that the conversion of individuals and of the world, depends upon the agency of the Holy Spirit. Dr. Chalmers eloquently proves that such a notion is both irrational and fanatical;

contrary to the analogy of human conduct in other departments of labour, and contrary to the express inculcation of Scripture. After describing an establishment as consisting in the employment by the state, (for the fulfilment of objects which the state is bound to seek, but which it has no agency of its own to accomplish,) of the machinery which the church supplies, he argues the compatibility of this contract between the parties, with the entire independence of the party whose services are purchased. He denies that the early contamination, and progressive deterioration of the church was owing to its establishment; its contamination having commenced before its establishment, and its deterioration being referable to causes capable of being separated from a state church. He considers that John Knox and the other reformers, took the right view of this subject, when they retained the existing ecclesiastical machinery, while they applied it to better purposes; and he places in strong and advantageous contrast, the enlightened procedure of the sixteenth century, with the violent and irrational assaults of the "machine breakers" of modern times upon the machinery itself. The second lecture commences with a powerful *argumentum ad hominem*, addressed to those who hold the endowments of individual congregations to be legitimate, but deny the propriety of territorial establishments. Having thus created in the minds of his hearers a prepossession against his opponents on the ground of their inconsistent practice, he next represents them as perverting and misapplying the principles of political economy. He asserts that voluntary churchmen would, if they had their way, deal with the spread of the gospel on the principles of free trade, leaving the supply of that commodity—as Dr. Chalmers himself would do in the instance of every other commodity—to be regulated by the demand for it on the part of those who need it. He shows, in the most unanswerable manner, that christian instruction is not an article which can be thus dealt with; inasmuch as it is the only "good" for which there is no natural longing, nay, to which there is an absolute aversion in the human mind. He proves that the conduct of voluntary churchmen belies the theoretical principle which he imputes to them; inasmuch as their missionaries are not paid by the heathen whom it is sought to convert, but by the friends of the gospel at home. He shows too that, at home, there are few voluntary places of worship which have not a debt upon them, or which do not owe their existence and maintenance to other sources than those to which the strict principles of free trade would limit them, viz. the contributions of their actual frequenters. If, however, the principles applicable to commerce are inapplicable to Christianity, may not, he asks, the voluntary principle be rested upon? in other words, if the ungodly will not seek and pay for religious instruction, will not the godly furnish it gratuitously? In order to answer this question, Dr. Chalmers subdivides voluntarism into two sorts, voluntarism *ab intra*, and voluntarism *ab extra*, the one being the motive which would induce a man to pay a minister for himself, the other the motive which would prompt him to maintain a minister for others. Internal voluntarism and free trade are shown to be convertible terms; while external voluntarism is said to involve a recognition of the establishment

principle! In one aspect the voluntary churchman is said to contend for a system, the inadequacy of which has already been exhibited; in the other aspect, he is represented as unconsciously surrendering the whole question at issue. For from the moment he allows external liberality to come in to the aid of local effort, from that moment he justifies the contributions of the state to the same purposes. Tithes and stipends are said to be identical in principle, with the contributions of Christians in London towards the spread of the gospel in Lincolnshire. He who concedes the propriety of the latter, disqualifies himself, it is said, from objecting to the former. Moreover, the experience of every day proves the inadequacy of the united efforts of both species of external voluntarism, to overtake the increase of population, and the spread of vice and infidelity. While, therefore, Dr. Chalmers hails the efforts of private Christians as a supplement to the grander enterprise of the state, he "confesses a greater value for experience than for experiments," and points to the unprovided millions of Britain as an argument against relinquishing the chief source from which the ministrations of religion are at present provided. Should this argument be met by the notion that governments are only conversant with the material interests of their subjects, Dr. Chalmers "protests altogether against this debasing view of government," and pleads the precedent of national contributions to universities and museums, to public parks and gardens, to the still more philanthropic purposes of relieving destitution in the Highlands, or rescuing the missing Greenland ships, and to the most analogous object of all, national education, in proof that governments have, and ought to have, "moral prerogatives" of their own. The desired assistance of government towards the increase of churches in Scotland would harmonize, it is said, with this view of the functions of governors, and would be nothing more than a splendid instance of external voluntarism. In his three concluding lectures, Dr. Chalmers takes for granted, that his readers are satisfied of the necessity of *some* establishment, that is, of *some* legal provision for a clergy. He proceeds to contend for a *territorial* establishment, that is, an arrangement which allots to each clergyman a stated district to be spiritually cultivated by himself; as distinguished from an arrangement for the mere maintenance of the clergyman, which would leave him to choose his own field of labour. And he then lays down the principles by which the state is to be guided in selecting the body of clergy to be employed by it. Protestantism is to be preferred to Popery; and as it would be inexpedient and impracticable, in working a territorial system, to employ the ministers of a diversity of sects, government is bound to adhere to that selection of an evangelical protestant sect which it has once made. Thus episcopacy is right in England, and presbyterianism in Scotland; while the existence of a protestant establishment in popish Ireland is justified by the necessity of popery, under any circumstances, being made to yield to protestantism.

As we are not of those who are convinced by the respected lecturer's reasonings, of the propriety of an establishment *at all*, it is needless for us to go into the discussion of how establishments ought to be

constituted. Upon this question the opinion of an advocate of the southern establishment will be more in point.

"When we plead to all these bodies, that, according to the principles of Dr. Chalmers, the State having selected one form of Evangelical Protestantism, is bound to abide by its choice, how shall we convince them of our own right to be considered evangelical? Is our doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration evangelical? Or the doctrine of Absolution? or that of the Holy Communion? (Those of Schism and the Apostolical Succession we suppose before abandoned as terms of entry into the Chalmersian Establishment.) Is it not plain that we should lose all the benefit of our sacrifices while we maintained any specific doctrines at all? Can that be an Evangelical Church which destroys more souls than it saves; as we learn from Dr. Pye Smith and Mr. Binney? Nay, we have some fear whether even Dr. Chalmers will stand by us; for we find that a great meeting of the Scotch Establishment at Glasgow lately decided enthusiastically, that 'Presbytery alone rests on the authority of Scripture;' and with all his patronizing notice of the English Church, there are ominous words in page 28, where, speaking of 'the established Churches' of England and Scotland, he kindly informs us that 'we require perhaps a very little change in our service-books' (words which cannot apply to the Scotch Establishment, as that which does not exist cannot require change), so that this very little change which we so unconsciously require, would probably include an alteration of our services for Baptism, the Holy Communion, Burial, Visitation of the Sick, Ordination—together with a considerable list of *et ceteras*. The sum and substance then of our gain in adopting Dr. Chalmers's line of argument is this, that after having abandoned our claim as an Apostolical Church, we should have to prove to our adversaries that we are Evangelical Protestants; and supposing this point established, should then at last, after much labour and danger, arrive at the high and palmy condition in which the Scotch Establishment is at this moment reposing. We should have to contend with the 'voluntaries,' and to keep, moreover, our place as the servants of state in opposition to all rivals."

—*British Critic*, p. 237.

We leave this dispute to the parties at issue, and proceed to the main question of the lectures. We must first, however, set Dr. Chalmers right upon one or two points in which he seems to misunderstand the views of voluntary churchmen. We do not believe that the agency of the Holy Spirit supersedes the necessity of human effort for the spread of the gospel. On the contrary, we know that it is the will of God, "by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe." The only question is, who are to be the preachers? Are they to be persons employed by the state, or are they to be persons either self-sustained, or sustained by the people of God? Again, we deny the imputation of desiring to treat the preaching of the gospel as a question of free trade. We are equally aware, with Dr. Chalmers, that in the unregenerate heart there is no desire for the gospel. But then the question arises, is the state to undertake to supply religious knowledge to those who do not possess it, or does this duty devolve upon those to whom, by God's grace, that knowledge has already been communicated? Having thus vindicated our characters as voluntary churchmen, we proceed to answer Dr. Chalmers's argument. We do not, however, intend to do so by following him through his reasonings in favour of the right and duty of the state to interfere in the religious instruction of the community. The assertion is, that the state is not only justified, but is bound, to employ *pastors* to evangelize the people. Now we request our readers to note the distinction between

pastors and missionaries. It is not a question, whether the state shall employ unattached evangelists. If that were the question, we should be prepared to meet it. But the point at issue is, shall the state provide for the support of Presbyters, of persons sustaining a relation to organized societies of Christians? Part of the duty of the clergy is to administer the Lord's Supper, the celebration of which involves the coming together of a christian society. The clergy, then, are supposed to be the officers of a society. Instead, then, of discussing with Dr. Chalmers, whether the state *ought* to take Presbyters into its pay, we shall at once take higher ground; and assuming that he will admit the rule, that that which cannot be done by a given party, there can be no obligation on that party to do, we distinctly assert, and that on premises which Dr. Chalmers will admit to be true, that it is physically impossible for the state to employ a body of pastors or Presbyters.

We assert, then, 1st, that a pastor is a result of a previously existing church; 2dly, that a church is a society of Christians; 3dly, that christian character is incapable of definition by law: and that, therefore, as the law cannot grasp christian societies, so as to be able to say with certainty, "this is a church!"—as the law cannot take hold of the cause, neither can it lay its hand on the effect. As it cannot define "churches," neither can it define "pastors," who are a consequence of churches.

1. We are not now contending with those who conceive that all that is necessary to constitute a pastor, is a certain mystical authority conveyed, for many ages, through channels full of the grossest impurity, and communicated by Episcopal or Presbyterian hands to the most ungodly, as well as to the most holy. We are not now arguing with such a man as good Mr. Melville, who tells us that the veriest doctrinal poison becomes food for the soul, if it have passed through the lips of an episcopally ordained clergyman. Alas! that so many excellent men, of whose personal conversion no doubt can be entertained, should be found, at the present day, building such wood, hay, and stubble on the one foundation of the Christian's faith! When their work shall be burned, as assuredly it will be, may they themselves be saved! Neither are we reasoning with some early Presbyterians, who, fresh from the superstitions of Popery, may have deemed that a virtue resided within their own church, which their fathers had too long attributed to the Popish priesthood. We are dealing with those who have solemnly proclaimed to Scotland, and to the world, that a pastor is no pastor, except he be the chosen Presbyter of a society of christian people. The following passages are taken from the series of tracts, written by Dr. Chalmers, and others, which we have before alluded to.

"Is it the clear and indefeasible right of a Christian man, to judge for himself under what ministry he shall sit—by what ministrations of the Gospel his soul is edified and blessed—to whose pastoral instructions and care he shall commit himself? Is it his sacred *duty*, as well as right, to look to his eternal welfare in this matter,—to look to it for himself, as he must answer for himself at the great day; to 'take heed what he hears,' as well as 'how he hears;' to take the Gospel on trust at no man's hands; 'not to believe every spirit, but to

try the spirits whether they be of God?" (1 John iv. 1.) It follows at once, from these plain principles of Scripture and common sense, that no minister may be thrust upon a congregation contrary to the will of the people."

"Be it observed, (and the iniquity of the thing thus comes more palpably out,) that intrusion can only be attempted after all. Physical force may thrust a minister upon the area and walls and pews of a church. Upon the people, without their own consent obtained in some way or other, no power on earth can thrust him. Tyranny, favoured by unhappy circumstances, may, indeed, often compel them to yield a reluctant consent. In country districts, for instance, where there is only one church within their reach, it may happen, in cases of intrusion, that rather than want a ministry altogether, many will in course of time attend the church, and allow the functionary to preach to them. But allow him they must, or he can never be their minister in point of fact, whatever the law may please to style him. In such a state of matters, — *consent being so indispensable from the very nature of the pastoral relation, that without it the relation practically can never exist at all*, — is it to be borne, that advantage shall be taken of the people's circumstances, to extort and wring from them a consent, which otherwise they not only would not be bound to give, but would be bound to withhold, on the ground of their honest and conscientious convictions?" — Tract V. p. 1.

"Every thing contained in the Word of God, bearing upon the settlement of ministers, the rights of conscience and of private judgment, the responsibilities and obligations of men, contributes to establish the great truth, that *the Christian people, that is, those who are duly and regularly admitted to the privileges of church membership, should, at the very least, have full liberty to give or withhold their consent to the settlement of a minister among them*, and by so doing to secure or prevent his admission as their pastor. The statements which the apostles have left to us of the conduct they pursued, and of the principles by which they were animated in such matters, plainly prove that they would have been no parties to thrusting ministers upon reclaiming congregations; and as we have also to this effect the testimony of Clement, mentioned by Paul, (Phil. iv. 3,) as one of his fellow-labourers, 'whose names are in the book of life,' and who was settled minister of the Church of Rome under apostolic superintendence. In his Epistle to the Church at Corinth, written during the lifetime of some of the apostles, he assures us that the apostles, in preaching the Gospel over the world, appointed the first-fruits of their ministry to be bishops and deacons, (for there were only two orders of ordinary ecclesiastical office-bearers in those days,) 'with the consent of the whole Church.' We are fully warranted to expect, that a principle which rests upon such high and sacred authority, and which is in itself so reasonable and proper, will work beneficially for the interests of religion, and that the neglect or violation of it will be attended with the most injurious consequences; and this has been most fully confirmed by the history of the Church of Scotland." — Tract VII. pp. 1, 2.

If any Christian doubts whether the above be a doctrine of Scripture, we refer him to the tracts themselves, the *religious* argument of which we conceive to be unanswerable.

II. Who, then, are "the christian people?" We believe the definition of the 19th Article of the Church of England cannot be improved. "A church of Christ is a congregation of faithful men, in which the pure word of God is preached, and the sacraments be duly ministered." The condition of a true church is two-fold, relating to the character of the people, and to the ministrations of the pastor. The pastor may be ever so faithful and efficient, but if the people be not a people fearing God and working righteousness, and if a jealous discipline be not maintained by the church over its members, with a view to this end, such a society is not a church of Christ.

III. A christian people must be a people of Christians, and hence the question arises, who, then, are Christians? Doubtless they are those "whom God hath chosen in Christ before the foundation of the world, that they should be holy and without blame before him in love." "He that is in Christ Jesus is a new creature; old things have passed away, all things have become new." "As many as have received Him, to them hath He given power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name; which were born, not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God." Between such there is a mutual recognition, a spiritual freemasonry; which, though there is much imperfection in all human discernment of character—much hypocrisy among professors, and much timidity among true believers—is yet sufficient for all practical purposes of discipline. But if even the people of God are liable to be imposed upon,—(and this is the argument constantly in the mouths of the pious opponents of pure communion)—how much more difficult must it be, or rather how utterly impossible, for the law of the land to define who are Christians! When the natural philosopher has learnt to take hold of the lightning or the wind, we shall believe it to be possible for unregenerate, or even regenerate, statesmen to define by statute the impalpable characteristics of christian character. Will it be attempted by the ancient mode of doctrinal tests? Alas! the experience of the three centuries during which the reformed churches have been in existence, has proved the utter inefficiency of such modes of ascertaining character. It is part of the case with which the Church of Scotland is now going to Parliament, that with all the admirable standards which the kirk possesses, and which every minister is compelled to subscribe, there is yet a large number of un-evangelical licentiates whom it is an object to keep out of parishes. The opponents of the veto are represented by Dr. Chalmers himself, (Tract xi. Page 5.) as "wanting to gratify their distaste for that theology which is dear to the people of Scotland," by forcing upon parishes persons by whom that theology will not be preached. But every one of the persons whom the veto would exclude, has passed through the most scrutinizing, doctrinal ordeal that ingenuity and piety could enact. If the law then has proved itself unable to test the ministers, how can it undertake to test the people? Or failing verbal tests, will it trust to the discernment of church officers and the efficiency of church discipline? This would be to assume that church officers are themselves spiritually minded, regenerate men. "Spiritual things are spiritually discerned." "Except a man be born again, he cannot see the kingdom of God." He feels not its existence; he recognizes not its subjects. Where then is the fulcrum, by the aid of which the philosophy of the state is to succeed in elevating the religious condition of the world? To what market shall the christian advocate of establishments have recourse (and we thank God that there are such statesmen,) in order that he may purchase that secret of evangelical chemistry, which shall effectually separate the godly from the ungodly. Purchase! purchase! purchase! Brethren in the Lord, remember, we beseech you, the words of the Apostle Peter, when Simon Magus offered him money, saying, "give me also this power, that on whomso-

ever I lay hands, he may receive the Holy Ghost." But Peter said unto him, "thy money perish with thee, because thou hast thought the gift of God may be purchased with money." It is true, you do not desire to purchase the power of communicating the Holy Spirit. But you do desire that the state should acquire the power of ascertaining the in-dwelling of the Holy Spirit. Both are the gift of God. Both are equally incapable of being either hired or purchased. Believe us, it is impossible for the law to define "a Christian." If then a Christian cannot be defined by statute, neither can a "christian church," be organized or the services of a spiritual pastor be secured by law. If you cannot engage pastors, neither can you have a Christian Establishment. You never can have, you never have had such an impossibility. Start not at this assertion! You have had, you have at this moment, establishments containing many Christians. But the machinery is not the less anti-christian. If the lapse of years should convince you that this is the case, will you not grieve that while you thought you were serving the cause of Christ the energies of your minds should have been directed to furthering the cause of antichrist?

We intended to have included in this article a full notice of Dr. Wardlaw's admirable and truly scriptural lectures, and the able prize essay of Mr. Angus. The length to which it has already extended itself, must plead our excuse with those honoured advocates of the church's liberties, for postponing to another occasion the grateful task which we had proposed to ourselves. We trust and believe that their labours will not have been in vain in the Lord. One word, however, to our friends and associates, the avowed adherents of voluntary churches. Brethren, a great responsibility is upon us. Our cause is believed by many to be the cause of irreligion, of sectarianism, or of avarice. We are supposed by many real Christians to be indifferent to the declaration of Scripture, that "righteousness exalteth a nation, but sin is a reproach to any people." We are accused of condemning the establishment on account of "the non-essentials of Christianity, the *nugæ triviales*, if not the *nugæ difficiles* of doctrine or government." (Chalmers, p. 174, concluding lecture.) We are thought to be seeking the abstraction of the wealth of this world from the Episcopal and Presbyterian churches of the empire, in order that Baptists, and Independents, and Wesleyans may obtain a share in the spoils. God is our witness that such are not the principles of those Christians who are seeking the separation of church and State. There may be demagogues, there may be men of the world, there may even be some few partially enlightened voluntary churchmen, who are influenced by one or more of these unsound motives. The honour of our Divine Master demands the public disavowal on our part of principles, which cannot be imputed to us without some reproach on Him whom we re-joice to serve. Nor is the success of our Master's cause less at stake, than our Master's honour. The coming of the kingdom of heaven depends upon "all rule and all authority and power being put down," which in any degree trespass upon our Lord's undivided sovereignty. It is true that it is God who will "put all these enemies under his feet." It is true that "the mystery of iniquity is to be consumed with the Spirit of the Lord's mouth, and be destroyed with the brightness

of his coming." But it is not less true that God works by means, and that one class of means which he condescends to employ, consists in the convictions of his people as to their line of duty. The knowledge which he has bestowed upon our churches concerning the spiritual nature of his kingdom, is a talent which we are not at liberty to wrap up in a napkin. We are bound to employ it to his glory. We are bound to trade with it. What, if in the prosecution of our righteous cause, we give offence to some who are near and dear to us? "When my father and my mother forsake me, then the Lord will take me up." Even if those with whom we "have taken sweet counsel, and walked unto the house of God in company," even if they should reproach and oppose us, yet our duty is not the less clear. "He that loveth father and mother more than Christ, is not worthy of Him." If God be dishonoured in the unholy alliance between his kingdom and the kingdoms of this world, man may condemn us for endeavouring to effect the discussion, but God will give us honour. Receive not, then, the honour which cometh one of another, but seek the honour that cometh from God only. Feel, too, for those of our brethren whose usefulness is impeded and whose happiness is shut up within the walls of the establishment. Trammelled by early habits and unable, even if they are disposed, to contend against the torrent of worldiness which sweeps through the very sanctuary, they kneel at the communion table by the side of the ungodly, they (in too many cases) listen habitually to the preaching of unconverted clergymen, they ally themselves with those with whom they have no community of religious sentiment, and shrink from the society of those whom they cannot but feel are children of the same Heavenly Father and heirs of the same glorious immortality. We believe that there is no greater agony in any section of the christian church, than is experienced by sensitive minds, placed in the situation which we have described. Let us rescue them, then, brethren, from their false position. They will oppose us now, but they will one day bless us. Let us regard them as friends, enduring the tortures of a disease of which we know the only remedy to be amputation. Let us not suffer their resistance, or our affection, to overpower our sense of what we owe to their friendship. But, above all, let us not forget what is our Lord's will in this matter. He who knew his Lord's will, and did it not, shall be beaten with many stripes, while he which knew not, shall be beaten with few stripes. We are convinced that it is his will that his people should render unto Cæsar the things which are Cæsar's, but unto God the things which are God's. Let us then seize the earliest opportunity of vindicating the honour of our Lord's kingdom. It will probably not be long ere such an opportunity will be afforded us.

The African Slave-trade. By Thomas Fowell Buxton, Esq. Second Edition. London: J. Murray. 8vo. pp. 240. 1839.

OF the many services which Mr. Buxton has rendered to the cause of humanity, we regard the production of the volume before us as incalculably the most important. It is a complete picture of the slave-trade; a picture, dark, hideous, revolting; exhibiting human nature in its worst aspect, human depravity in its most malignant excess, and human suffering in its utmost intensity and most aggravated form. Who would willingly dwell upon such a picture! Yet it is one which needs to be not merely casually contemplated, but deeply studied. The disposition to relieve distress can be sustained only by investigation. A spirit of active benevolence can only co-exist with the full persuasion of the existence of the evils to be abated, and an intimate acquaintance with their nature, causes, and results.

Mr. Buxton's work is peculiarly well-timed. Now that slavery is abolished in our own colonies, the moral mind of Britain is beginning seriously to entertain the question of universal abolition. We owe a vast debt to Africa. We have heaped wrong and outrage for ages on her children, and, if we would prove the sincerity of our repentance, we must now make compensation and restitution. Never can Britain retire with honour from this field, till the last slave-ship has left the coast of Africa, and till the fetters have fallen from the limbs of the last slave.

We rejoice to perceive that Mr. Buxton's labours are duly appreciated, as is evidenced not only by the rapid absorption of the first edition of his work, but by the numerous articles of which it has furnished the theme in the monthly magazines and the leading provincial newspapers. Various circumstances have prevented our noticing it earlier, but we purpose, in our present number, to present a view of the extent and character of the slave-trade, reduced from his more ample delineation, and afterwards to discuss with him the results of the means hitherto employed for its extinction, and finally, to offer some remarks on Mr. Buxton's hints of a new plan for its suppression.

When the slave-trade was relinquished, in 1807, by the British nation, its extent was estimated at from 70,000 to 80,000 annually, by the most competent authorities. About half this number were absorbed by the British Colonies, and our merchants were likewise the great slave-carriers for the other markets of the western world. It was not unnatural, therefore, for the philanthropists of that day to suppose, that the abolition of the trade by Britain would prove the death-blow of the traffic. Never was there a greater mistake. Mr. Buxton shows that its present extent cannot be less than 150,000 annually, and that it probably very far exceeds that number. He rests his proofs mainly on the testimony of British official residents in the slave-trading ports. The Brazilian empire is the most deeply implicated. The importation of slaves into the port of Rio Janeiro, in one year, was 56,777, and into four other principal ports, Bahia, Pernambuco, Maranhão, and Para, 21,554, leaving a total of 78,331 for the whole empire. "So many, at least, were landed.

That number is undisputed. * * * * But is it easy to believe, while Brazil receives so vast a number into five of her principal ports, that the trade is confined to them, and that none are introduced along the remaining line of her coast, extending over 38 degrees of latitude, or about 2600 miles, and abounding in harbours, rivers, and creeks, where disembarkation can easily be effected?" (pp. 4, 5.) We fear Mr. Buxton's estimate is very far within the mark. His authorities, it will be observed, are of a date preceding, by a short interval, the abolition of the trade by Brazil, in 1830; but he shows, from the *public declarations* of the high functionaries of that government, that their pretended abolition law does not prevent the trade being carried on with increased vigour. Indeed, Brazil might well have spared her fictitious and hypocritical *abolition*.

In corroboration of Mr. Buxton's statements, we may refer to a list now before us, carefully compiled from official documents, of the vessels belonging to the port of Rio engaged in the slave-trade, under the *Portuguese flag*, in the year 1837, (eight years subsequent to the *abolition* of the traffic.) These vessels land their cargoes on the coast, sometimes even at the entrance of the port, and then enter Rio in ballast, to refit for a new voyage. The trade is, in fact, openly carried on, with the connivance of the government, to a greater extent than ever, as is apparent from the following

Extract of Letter from "Mr. Gordon to Viscount Palmerston, January 19th, 1838."

"During the year 1837, 92 vessels under the Portuguese flag have entered this port from the coast of Africa, after landing their cargoes of slaves in the neighbourhood. By these vessels 41,616 slaves have been imported; this number, however, is short of the actual importation, because some vessels have made two or three voyages during the year, without having entered the port; and no account has been made of their cargoes, except for the voyage on which they have entered to refit.

"The slave-trade with this port, I regret to add, has increased to a fearful and unprecedented extent.

"New negroes are now openly exposed for sale in several parts of the city, and at Toquahy, a few leagues distant, there is established a regular market for them, exactly as before the passing of the law of November 7, 1831."

The following quotations from the list referred to, and of which the above extract is a summary, sufficiently indicate the character of the Brazilian slave-trade.

"Brig '*Leao*,' from Quilamane. Embarked 855 slaves; of these 283 died, or were thrown overboard alive, during the voyage. The smallpox having appeared among the slaves, 30 of them were immediately thrown overboard alive; afterwards the measles made its appearance, of which 253 died. The remaining slaves, 572 in number, were landed on the coast of Brazil, at Mozambayo, near to Ilha Grande, but in so miserable a state, that the greater number could not walk, but were carried on shore. Some of the crew of the vessel also died from the sickness on board."

"No. 6. Schooner, '*Josefina*,' from Angola, landed 420 slaves, in a very sickly state, at Campos. During the voyage a great number of the slaves embarked died from the crowded state of the hold, the number shipped being greater than the vessel could well stow."

The most important slave-market, after Brazil, is the island of Cuba.

Here we find it impossible to ascertain the numbers imported with any degree of precision. "Every thing that artifice, violence, intimidation, popular countenance, and official connivance can do, is done to conceal the extent of the traffic." (p. 13.) For Spain has *abolished* the slave-trade, and therefore finds it necessary to add hypocrisy to villany. "A privilege, (that of entering the harbour after dark,) *denied to all other vessels, is granted to the slave-trader.*"—(p. 13.)

Mr. Buxton exhibits data sufficient to prove that the importations into Cuba exceed 60,000 annually. The trade is also carried on to a considerable, though unknown extent, to Porto Rico, Texas, Buenos Ayres, and other of the new republics of the South American continent. These last have, like Brazil, their abolition law, the only use of which is to procure bribes for the officers of government, and the name of *colonists* for the imported Africans.

"It is most disheartening to find that, in spite of all our efforts, the slave-trade, instead of ceasing where it has long prevailed, is spreading over these new and petty states; and that the first use they make of their flag, (which, but for us, they never would have possessed,) is to thwart Great Britain and to cover the slave-trade; and farther, to learn that their slave-traffic is attended with even more than the usual horrors. It must not be forgotten, that, as we have just seen, for a voyage from the southern coast of Africa to Monte Video, (a voyage of some thousands of miles,) the space allowed is less than one ton for three slaves."—(pp. 20, 21.)

British manufacturers and merchants are indirectly implicated to a great extent in slave-trading, but the merchants of the United States do not allow them to monopolize this iniquitous source of gain. The British Commissioners at Havanna observe, in one of their reports, that the declaration of the American President, "not to make the United States a party to any convention on the subject of the slave-trade, has been the means of inducing American citizens to build and fit, in their own ports, vessels *only calculated for piracy or the slave-trade*, to enter this harbour, and, in concert with the Havanna slave-traders, to take on board a prohibited cargo, manacles, &c. and proceed openly to that notorious dépôt for this iniquitous traffic, the Cape de Verde Islands, under the shelter of their national flag." (pp. 22, 23.) Since that ominous declaration of President Jackson, the citizens of the United States have embarked openly in the slave-traffic under the national colours, and the United States and the "respectable" kingdom of Portugal now divide the slave-carrying business of the world between them. How long will the former people endure this disgraceful association. But we must recur to British participation in the slave-trade. From private information in which we place confidence, we believe some of the British merchants resident in Rio to be deeply implicated. There are houses whose sole or principal business it is to supply "coast goods" (a description of cotton fabrics used only in the slave-trade,) to the slave-dealer, for the purpose of bartering for slaves. Some of these firms exhibit names well known and highly respected in this country. We could instance among the offenders two members of Parliament, one representing an important manufacturing empo-

rium, and the other the Quaker constituency of a northern borough. We trust the British and Foreign Anti-Slavery Society, recently established, will place all such offenders at the bar of public opinion, and will investigate the present extent of British connection with this horrible traffic. We fear the result will prove that the slave-trade is yet, to a great extent, carried on with British capital. Indeed, Mr. Buxton's "corroborative proofs of the extent of the slave-trade," does not leave a doubt of the fact. Capt. M'Lean, the intelligent Governor of Cape Coast Castle, whose official station affords him extensive opportunities of becoming intimately conversant with the mode in which the traffic is conducted, states that one-third of the slaves are paid for in Manchester cotton goods of a description "intended for the slave-trade, and adapted only for that trade." Thus Manchester and Glasgow are the nurses of the slave-trade. There are men in those cities, probably of high standing in the commercial, and possibly of high pretension in the religious world, who deliberately abet the slave-trade, and are conscious accessories to innumerable acts of *piracy* and murder!

Our attention is next claimed by the Mahomedan Slave Trade, which is carried on "for the supply of the Mahomedan markets of Morocco, Tunis, Tripoli, Egypt, Turkey, Persia, Arabia and the borders of Asia." (p. 37.)

A vast geographical extent of country is drained of its population by this branch of the traffic, but we have no space for details. The negro Moslem tribes are the active agents in carrying it on, and the pagan tribes are its victims. Mr. Buxton estimates the maritime trade on the east coast of Africa at 30,000, and the caravan trade by way of the desert at 20,000 annually, an average which is greatly less than he would be justified from his data in assuming. The Pacha of Egypt has lately rushed into this detestable trade with his characteristic avidity and want of principle. In reckless barbarity and cruelty he has distanced all competition, and is without a rival in infamy.

"He employs regularly a considerable part of his army in marauding expeditions into the interior of Africa, and is at this moment by far the greatest stealer and seller of negroes in the world. The compunction of a French adventurer, who had spent several years in this horrible service, has produced an appalling revelation of the facts, which M. Leod de la Barde has made public in a most striking tract entitled *Chasse aux Negres*, Paris, 1838."—*Quarterly Review*, No. 126. Note, p. 372.

Of the negroes captured by the Egyptian troops the most able are incorporated into the army, a large proportion of the remainder distributed among the officers and soldiers in liquidation of arrears of pay, and the old and infirm given to the Bedouins, "who are the most merciless of masters." Of the ultimate fate of the most favoured class of these unhappy victims, the following extract from the *Quarterly Review* is sufficiently descriptive!

"The hopes of the Pacha, however, were greatly disappointed in these black troops (captured in Soudan).—They were strong able-bodied men, and not averse from being taught; but when attacked by disease, which soon broke out in the camp, they died like sheep infected with the rot. The medical men

ascribed the mortality to moral rather than physical causes; it appeared in numerous instances, that having been snatched away from their homes and families, they were even anxious to get rid of life; and such was the dreadful mortality that ensued, that out of 20,000 of these unfortunate men, 3,000 did not remain alive at the end of two years."

The testimony of Dr. Bowring respecting the extent and character of the Egyptian slave-trade, fully corroborates the preceding statements. The towns and ports of Egypt are now crowded slave marts.

In summing up the evidence he has adduced of the number of slaves annually torn from Africa, Mr. Buxton states the

Christian slave-trade at	-	-	-	150,000
The Mahommedan at	-	-	-	50,000
Total				200,000

It is evident, however, that this statement is a *minimum*. There is little doubt that the true number exceeds a *quarter of a million*.

"Hitherto," he proceeds, "I have stated less than the half of this dreadful case. I am now going to show, that besides the 200,000 annually carried into captivity, there are claims on our compassion for almost countless cruelties and murders growing out of the slave-trade. I am about to prove that this multitude of our enslaved fellow men is but the remnant of numbers vastly greater, the survivors of a still larger multitude, over whom the slave-trade spreads its devastating hand, and that for every ten who reach Cuba or Brazil, and become available as slaves,—fourteen, at least, are destroyed.

"This mortality arises from the following causes:—

"1. The original seizure of the slaves.

"2. The march to the coast and detention there.

"3. The middle passage.

"4. The sufferings after capture and after landing.

"5. The initiation into slavery, or the 'seasoning,' as it is termed by the planters." (p. 49.)

We will consider first the seizure, march, and detention on the coast. The vast continent of Africa is the scene of continual rapine, murder, and intestine war. The strong prey upon the weak, and security and peace are unknown. Every African Traveller, Mungo Park, Bruce, Lyon, Gray, Denham, Clapperton, the Landers, Macgregor, Laird, and many others, all bear witness to the plunder, night burnings, and indiscriminate massacres which occur in the continual wars of the chiefs, wars which have but one object—to procure slaves.

"Major Denham says; 'On attacking a place it is the custom of the country instantly to fire it: and as the villages are composed of straw huts only, the whole is shortly devoured by the flames. The unfortunate inhabitants fly quickly from the devouring element, and fall immediately into the hands of their no less merciless enemies, who surround the place; the men are quickly massacred, and the women and children lashed together and made slaves.'" (pp. 55, 56.)

All legitimate commerce and peaceful industry are stifled by this accursed traffic.

"Commodore Owen, who was employed in the survey of the Eastern Coast of Africa about the years 1823 and 1824, says: 'The riches of Quilimane consisted, in a trifling degree, of gold and silver, but principally of grain, which was produced in such quantities as to supply Mozambique. But the introduction of

the slave-trade stopped the pursuits of industry, and changed those places, where peace and agriculture had formerly reigned, into the seat of war and bloodshed. Contending tribes are now constantly striving to obtain, by mutual conflict, prisoners as slaves for sale to the Portuguese, who excite these wars, and fatten on the blood and wretchedness they produce." (p. 57.)

There are, of course, no means of estimating the proportion who perish in the seizure. The adults of both sexes and the little children, are often indiscriminately slaughtered, and the youths only are reserved for slaves. The fate of those who are put to death by their cruel captors is incomparably the happier destiny. The misery and loss of life sustained on the march, whether to the coast or through the desert, are indescribable and almost incredible. Of the latter, Major Denham observes,

"Round the spot, (the well of Meshroo) were lying more than one hundred skeletons; our camels did not come up till dark, and we bivouacked in the midst of those unearthened remains of the victims of persecution and avarice, after a long day's journey of twenty-six miles, in the course of which one of our party counted one hundred and seven of these skeletons."

Shortly afterwards he adds:—

"During the last two days we had passed on an average from sixty to eighty or ninety skeletons each day; but the numbers that lay about the wells at El Hammar were countless." (p. 83.)

"The next cause of mortality arises from the detention of the slaves on the coast before they are embarked, and this occurs for the most part, when the vessel for which they may be destined, has not arrived or is not ready to sail, or may be in dread of capture after sailing." (p. 87.)

As the maintenance of slaves would occasion expense, they are often left to die of starvation. Lander says, at Badagry, one of the principal marts, the old, infirm, and sickly are pinioned and thrown into the river; while slaves, "who for other reasons are rejected by the merchants, undergo the same punishment, *or are left to endure more lively torture at the sacrifices*, by which means hundreds of human beings are annually destroyed. (p. 90.)

Mr. Buxton gives us an instance of a Portuguese brig with four hundred slaves detained up one of the rivers in the Bight of Biafra, in consequence of information that a British vessel was lying in wait; and during a delay of several weeks all her slaves perished, "with the exception of about a score," chiefly from starvation.

The following heart-rending narrative is detailed by Captain Cook, an eye-witness, in a letter to the editor of the *Standard*, dated 16th of July, 1838.

"Slaves to the number of two hundred and fifty, or thereabouts, male and female, adults and children, were brought in canoes from Senna, a Portuguese settlement at some distance in the interior of Africa, to be sold at Quilimane, there being at that time several slavers lying in the river. These unfortunate beings were consigned to a person holding a high civil appointment under the Portuguese government, (the collector of customs :) these poor creatures were from a part of the country where it is said the natives make bad slaves; consequently, and as there was abundance of human flesh in the market, they did not meet with a ready sale. The wretch to whom they were consigned, *actually refused them sustenance of any kind*. Often have I been compelled to witness the melancholy spectacle of from twelve to twenty of my fellow creatures, without

distinction of age or sex, chained together with a heavy iron chain round the neck, wandering about the town in quest of food to satisfy the cravings of nature, picking up bones and garbage of every description from the dung heaps, snails from the fields, and frogs from the ditches, and, when the tide receded, collecting the shell-fish that were left on the bank of the river, or sitting round a fire roasting and eagerly devouring the sea-weed. Again and again have I seen one or more of these poor creatures, when unable from sickness to walk, crawling on their hands and knees, accompanying the gang to which they were chained, when they went in search of their daily food,—for one could not move without the whole. In consequence of this treatment, they soon became so emaciated, that the slave-dealers would not purchase them on any terms; in this state, horrid as it must appear, the greater part were left to perish, without food, medicine, or clothing,—their bones protruding through the skin, they presented the appearance of living skeletons, lingering amidst hunger and disease, till death, their best friend, released most of them at once, from suffering and bondage." (pp. 94, 95.)

"It is evident," adds Mr. Buxton "that this branch of the case furnishes an item of no small magnitude in the black catalogue of negro destruction." (p. 95.)

There yet remain to be considered the horrors of the "middle passage," a name which implies an inconceivable amount of crime and suffering, disease and death.

"Never," said Mr. Wilberforce, "can so much misery be found condensed into so small a space as in a slave ship during the middle passage." Mr. Buxton says, "I have received communications, both by letter and in conversation from many naval officers who have boarded slave-ships, and I have observed, that without an exception they all make this observation,—'No words can describe the horrors of the scene, or the sufferings of the negroes.'"

We might crowd our pages with scenes of horror from the testimony of eye-witnesses, but we utterly despair, even with such aids, of giving an adequate representation of the dreadful reality. It is necessary, however, to observe, that as the slave-trade is more than doubled in extent, so is it carried on, incredible as it may appear, with aggravated cruelty and suffering to its victims, in consequence chiefly of the well-meant and humane efforts of the British Government to suppress it.

"The treatment of slaves by the British," observes Mr. Buxton, "subsequent to the Slave Regulation Act, and down to 1808, was mildness itself, when compared with the miseries consequent on the trade; and the system which has been pursued in the vain attempt to put it down, since that treatment to the present time." (p. 107.)

Mr. Laird says, "Instead of the large and commodious vessels which it would be the interest of the slave-trader to employ, we have by our interference forced him to use a class of vessels, (well-known to naval men as *American clippers*,) of the very worst description that could have been imagined for the purpose, every quality being sacrificed for speed. In the holds of these vessels the unhappy victims of European cupidity are stowed literally in bulk." (p. 132.)

Mr. Jackson, formerly Judge in Mixed Commission Court at Sierra Leone, says, "I think the sufferings of these poor slaves are greatly aggravated by the course now adopted; for the trade is now illegal; and therefore whatever is done is done clandestinely; they are packed more like bales of goods than human beings, and the general calculation is, that if in three adventures one succeeds, the owners are well paid." (p. 133.)

To these considerations must be added the increased loss of life

occasioned by the detention of slaves on the coast when a British cruiser is in waiting, and the dreadful scenes which occur during the chase. There are numerous authenticated cases of whole cargoes of slaves being thrown overboard, a prey to the sharks, in order to destroy the evidence of occupation, and in one case a number of girls were packed in casks and thrown into the sea during a hot pursuit.

The loss from wreck and casualties, and the waste of life that occurs after landing, as the effect of previous sufferings, and of the "seasoning," remain still to be added to the account, but we have no space for further details, and will simply state that Mr. Buxton estimates the destruction of life from all these sources to bear the following proportion to the actual number who become slaves :

	per cent.
1. Seizure, march, and detention - - -	100
2. Middle passage and after capture - - -	25
3. After landing and in the seasoning - - -	20
	<hr/>
	145

So that for every 1000 negroes alive at the end of a year after their deportation, and available to the planter, we have a sacrifice of 145." (p. 168.)

The total annual loss to Africa, occasioned by the Christian and Mahommedan slave-trade, exceeds 475,000, according to the moderate estimate of Mr. Buxton.

"Even this is but a part of the total evil. The great evil is, that the slave-trade exhibits itself in Africa as a barrier, excluding every thing which can soften, or enlighten, or civilize, or elevate the people of that vast continent. The slave-trade suppresses all other trade, creates endless insecurity, kindles perpetual war, banishes commerce, knowledge, social improvement, and, above all, Christianity, from one quarter of the globe, and from 100,000,000 of mankind." (p. 171.)

It is unnecessary for us to add a single word to heighten the effect of these naked figures and simple statements, and we will therefore conclude this part of our case with the comment of a contemporary :

"Let the fact be engraven on every memory, that the slave-trade, besides its living victims, requires the *continual daily sacrifice of a thousand human lives*—a sacrifice offered at the shrine of Mammon and Moloch, by the remorseless cupidity and cruelty of nations professedly Christian. If the entire globe were inhabited by barbarous tribes, Africa would enjoy a state of comparative happiness and tranquillity, but at present the nations of the civilized world are leagued in one vast conspiracy against her peace. It is to our minds one of the most affecting considerations growing out of the subject, that the expanded intellect and commercial enterprise, and the refined luxury of the most enlightened portion of the human family should be employed in rendering that unhappy continent 'one universal den of desolation, misery, and crime.'"—*Leeds Mercury*, May 11, 1839.

(To be concluded in our next.)

A Comparative View of the English and Scottish Dissenters; with a Preliminary Dissertation on their Views, Designs, and Duty, in reference to the Ecclesiastical Establishments of the Country; to which is appended, a Lecture on Patronage. By Adam Thomson, D. D. Coldstream. Edinburgh: Oliphant and Son. 12mo. Second Edition. 1839.

THE "Comparative View" is a highly meritorious production. The idea is as full of originality as of practical sagacity, and the execution is every way worthy of it. It is probable that posterity will assign to it a high place among the intellectual implements of the present period, by which the Head of the Church hath worked his sovereign pleasure in relation to his own cause in the northern part of the British Empire. The historian of the Voluntary Controversy—by far the most important question of our times—will doubtless appreciate the value of this publication at the time of its seasonable appearance, and do justice to the claims of its author. The late lamented Mr. Ballantyne fairly launched this great question, in his admirable "Comparison of Established and Dissenting Churches;" but that question, even in his master-hand, assumed rather a theoretical than a practical aspect. Enlightened and candid men entertained no doubt of the perfect conclusiveness of his reasonings; but the idea of giving them a practical direction seemed then visionary and impossible. The truth is, that had the merits of the question been even much more fully appreciated, and its immediate practical bearings much more distinctly seen, and much more powerfully felt by individuals, still the mass of the Dissenters, considered as churches and as bodies, were wholly unprepared for confederated efforts in support of it. Four years later, it pleased God to awaken a spirit of benevolent inquiry, the spirit of a peace-maker, in the bosom of the Secession Minister of Coldstream. It is clear, however, that the ruling idea in the mind of Dr. Thomson, when he wrote his "Comparative View," was not the shaking of establishments, but the spread of the kingdom of Christ, both at home and abroad. Indeed, he had not then discovered the extent to which such establishments stand in the way of that great and glorious enterprise.

The writer appears to have clearly foreseen that the several bodies of Dissenters—especially Scottish Presbyterian Dissenters, required much individual improvement in order to successful evangelical effort, and that a more intimate and general union among the whole was also absolutely indispensable. To effect these two paramount objects was the avowed design of his book. This, as a governing principle, pervades every page of the volume. Possessing a mind strongly endowed with the power of generalizing, and almost, if not altogether, divested of the last remnant of denominational bigotry, he sat down to contemplate the religious condition of his country. He beheld, every where, the marks of feebleness arising from division, and the comparative inefficiency attending not a little of the existing evangelical instrumentality. His views of union being in the highest degree catholic as opposed to sectarian, and his object being not simply to unite, but to improve, the entire collective body of Scotch and English Dissenters, he framed his work accordingly; and that work

consists of the following chapters:—I. On the Education of Candidates for the Christian Ministry in Literature and Philosophy; II. On the Education of Candidates for the Ministry in Theology; III. On the Probation and Ordination of Candidates for the Ministry; IV. On the Pastoral Care, and on the Mode of Preaching, &c. &c.; V. On the Admission of Church Members; VI. On Public Worship; VII. On Creeds and Confessions; VIII. On Church Government; IX. On Church Discipline.

From the above Contents, it will appear that the "Comparative View" is a thoroughly ecclesiastical volume; and, in all its aspects, it is eminently practical. The value of such a work to the christian ministry, and its tendencies, in relation to the cause of Christ, must be immediately obvious; but the extreme difficulty of the execution may not be so readily apparent. That difficulty can be fully estimated only by the few who are equal to it. Comparisons are proverbially odious; and to conduct them with success, it requires a skilful hand, and a mind richly endowed with a delicate sense of propriety, as well as no small share of self-denial and moral courage. The first and second chapters involve a multiplicity of most momentous topics, which have, in divers ways, subjected the author to a severe and searching test; but he has nobly sustained the ordeal. He has boldly spoken the truth, the whole truth, and, in our view, nothing but the truth. He has most faithfully and fearlessly attacked some of the most cherished and darling prejudices of his connection and of his country, and with great force of argument he has, on most points, developed the "more excellent way." We particularly admire Chapter VI. on Public Worship, where the subject of Frequent and of Free Communion is handled with an ability and an enlightened liberality, never previously even approached by any Scottish Presbyterian writer on these topics. Only Scotchmen, we believe, can fully estimate the importance of such a disquisition in Scotland, and the moral courage at that time necessary to its publication among Presbyterian Dissenters. To deliver our opinions in full, would make a comment equal in magnitude to thrice the text; we must, therefore, satisfy ourselves with the brief and honest avowal, that Dr. Thomson has fully established his position, viz. that "Dissenting Churches in South and North Britain exhibit a remarkable similarity in whatever is *essential*, in the faith of the Gospel, in the administration of divine ordinances, and in the practice of holy obedience;" and "that there are some things which call for improvement, both among the one set of Dissenters and the other." In this similarity in all essential matters, Dr. Thomson insists and contends that he has found the basis of unity; and, in conclusion, he thus proceeds:—

"On some such basis as this, might not ALL the Evangelical Dissenters throughout the length and breadth of the land, unite for the purpose of promoting the spread of evangelical truth and practical religion at home, and also abroad, even to the ends of the earth? In the mean time, were the ministers, as well as those composing their respective flocks, to hold communion with one another as opportunity offered, and to be considered as 'the body of Christ and members in particular,' as one vast ecclesiastical body, united under the same divine Head, what an enchanting sight would this be to friends, and what a

terrific front would they present to their enemies, 'looking forth as the morning, fair as the moon, clear as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners.'

"Union is strength. Were the many thousands of Dissenters in Britain, who hold precisely the same faith and hope, to unite for securing the maintenance and spread of the great cause about which they are perfectly agreed, what, under the guidance and with the blessing of Him whose cause it is, might they not speedily effect! They could thus bring into action such a mighty combination of piety and talent, patriotism and loyalty, as would ensure the continued enjoyment of the valuable civil privileges already possessed by them, and the speedy restoration of those of which, especially in England, they have been so unjustly deprived. It is because they have never done justice to themselves, by exhibiting their numerical importance and their moral strength; but, instead of acting in concert, have, by adhering to their party and paltry distinctions, given too much cause for the minions of men in power, both in church and state, to represent them as wretched sectaries, split into endless divisions, and deserving no consideration whatever—that they have been treated sometimes with gross injustice, and often with great contempt."—pp. 291, 292.

When the "Comparative View" was written, the voluntary controversy had not burst forth; and Dr. Thomson seems to have inculcated the great lesson of Evangelical unity mainly for the purpose of gospel diffusion. The spirit which breathes throughout the work is pre-eminently one of sweetness and good-natured benevolence, but there are not wanting springs of that power, and flashes of that light, by which the productions of the author have been since so signalized. The same acuteness, the same comprehensiveness, the same faculty of analysis and generalization, the same argumentative ability and penetrating sagacity, the same occasional sprightliness, and some of the other qualities which have rendered the author a first man in the first rank of voluntary writers, are every where apparent.—The result of the comparison between the Scotch and English Dissenters, is, upon the whole, very flattering to ourselves; in some cases, indeed, the author accords to us more than we think we can justly claim; at the same time we hold, that, in several places, we have been rather hardly dealt by. We might instance, in page 100, where, we are confident, the author labours under a misapprehension respecting English "invitation" to the pastorate. That mode, against which Dr. Thomson sees "many and strong objections," appears to us to be in exact harmony with nature and with scripture; and, in its practical working, we find no evils from which the Presbyterian mode could possibly deliver us. Again, in page 116, we must insist that Dr. Thomson really injures us, in his statements concerning the ordination of our pastors. He reprobates the practice of putting questions, at our ordinations, upon the subject of personal religion, and of motives for entering the ministry—questions to which we attach the greatest possible importance. He assumes, that we exact of the candidate "a minute detail of his past grievous sins, and his present great penitence and piety." We neither demand nor approve any thing of the sort; and seldom, indeed, is any such thing inflicted upon us. We have, in this respect, very rarely witnessed a violation of propriety. Dr. Thomson says, "a good experience, as they call it, is expected." "A good confession," and a true statement of the reason of the hope that is in him, are certainly expected; but, if this is to be identified

with something very wonderful, very transcendental, and captivating to the vulgar ear, it is incorrect. Yet Dr. Thomson maintains, that, to get up this "*good experience*," "the young minister is strongly tempted, if not to pour forth fabrications, yet so to distort some facts, and to give such a strong colouring to others, as to lead to conclusions, which simple and ingenuous statements could never have been found to warrant." In this assumption we desiderate the charity that thinketh no evil; and we can assure the author that his fears are groundless. That such things have occasionally occurred, we will not deny; but we do consider, that the fear of God, the love of Christ, and the grace of his Holy Spirit in our young brethren, are sufficient guarantees against the frequent recurrence of such evils. With these small abatements—which are but matters of opinion—we dismiss the "Comparative View," and do most cordially commend it to the pastors and churches of Christ as a work of the utmost importance, and more especially at the present time. It is admirably adapted to promote, not only unity, harmony, and holy confederation among all evangelical bodies, but also to promote their improvement in many matters of vital importance to their usefulness. We have reason to believe that it has done good and great service already in these respects. It deserves the deliberate and thoughtful perusal of every pastor and church officer in the British empire.

While thus much is due to the original work, we must bestow a passing notice on the invaluable accompaniments of this edition. The Preliminary Dissertation is, of itself no mean publication, comprising, as it does, one hundred and fourteen closely printed pages. It consists of three sections, the first of which sets forth "the views held, and the conduct hitherto pursued by English and Scottish Dissenters, in reference to ecclesiastical establishments;" the second discloses "the ultimate designs which Dissenters profess now to entertain, in reference to ecclesiastical establishments;" and the third develops "the methods which Dissenters should henceforth pursue, in order to the attainment of their ultimate designs." The value of a dissertation on such topics, from such a pen, need scarcely be pointed out. To the Dissertation there are appended, as notes and illustrations, a multiplicity of very important documents, which have been issued by the religious bodies of Scotland, in connection with the great questions which have of late years been agitated in that country. The volume concludes with a Lecture on Church Patronage, which contains a most masterly view of that great question, such a view as we have never yet found in the same compass. This Lecture abounds with truthful remarks, which have been both justified and confirmed by the decision lately pronounced in the House of Lords, upon the celebrated case of the parish of Auchteraunder, a decision fatal to the hope of Scottish high churchmen, who by it have been covered with confusion and overwhelmed with dismay: the whole fabric of their boasted independence of the State being for ever demolished as if by the stroke of a thunderbolt.

CRITICAL NOTICES.

The Missionary Vine, showing at one View all the Stations of the London Missionary Society since its Commencement. By Hannah Elizabeth Rahmn. London: John Snow.

WE regret that we have so long delayed to introduce this ingenious and useful sheet to the notice of our readers. It gives not only the names of the stations at present occupied by the Society's missionaries, but all those which ever have been the scene of their labours, with the dates of their commencement and discontinuance. It also enables the spectator to discover at a glance, where christian churches have been formed, and whether the agents employed are Europeans or natives.

We should recommend it to every friend of missions to possess himself of the *Missionary Vine*. It would form a most appropriate addition, not only to the furniture of the closet, but to that of any room allotted to missionary committee or prayer-meetings.

But on young people especially, Miss Rahmn has conferred a great advantage, by presenting them with this information in a form so likely to engage and interest their minds. We trust the number of parents is increasing, who make it a regular part of their children's christian education, to familiarize them with the details of missionary labour and success. And such is now the rich variety of intelligence furnished to us, both by the publications and the living voice of many of the devoted labourers themselves, that scarcely a place can be found among the branches of this *Vine*, respecting which a teacher or parent may not be able to give his youthful circle a "true story"—such a story as children love, and which even angels disdain not to hear. May it be the ambition of our rising race, to aid in multiplying these precious clusters a hundred-fold.

Egypt: a familiar Description of the Land, People, and Produce. With a Map and fifty-three Wood Engravings. 12mo. cloth. pp. vi. 330. W. Smith, London.

EGYPT must necessarily be an interesting subject of inquiry to every intelligent reader of sacred or profane history. Egypt, as the seat of a branch of the immediate descendants of Noah—one of the most celebrated nations of antiquity—the nursery of ancient wisdom and science—as the "iron furnace" to the enslaved Israelites—as immediately connected with the "holy nation" throughout the fifteen centuries of their national existence—cannot fail to be deeply interesting to every attentive observer of Divine Providence, to every serious reader of the Holy Scriptures.

"A familiar Description of the Land, People, and Produce of Egypt," therefore, must be valuable to all classes, and especially to those young persons who are receiving a superior christian education either at home or in schools. We sincerely recommend this highly instructive volume, which is the work of considerable skill and labour, compiled from the most respectable authorities, enriched with many quotations from the recent publications of Lane and Wilkinson.

The Table of the Lord. By the Author of the Listener, &c. London: Seeley and Burnside. pp. 299.

To the admirers of Miss Fry's former productions, this little work will be very acceptable. It treats of "External Ordinances," "the Sacraments," "the Institution of the Lord's Supper," "the Benefits exhibited and received in the Lord's Supper," of "those who refuse to come to the Lord's Table," "those that are afraid to come," "those that come unworthily, and worthily," "those that have faithfully received the Sacrament," and "those receiving for the first

time." Now and then we observe something like the extreme opinions, which are so common in the Episcopal church. As when she says, "thence I infer, that it is to depart from God's appointed mode of teaching, to attempt to satisfy the intellect of the fitness and wisdom of the atonement, before it is accepted on the testimony of the written word:" (p. 74.) or as when she asserts, "he is a son of God to whom justice has become a *debtor* for the reward of righteousness." (p. 83.) In general, however, the piety, the soundness, and the catholicism of her views, will commend her, to all true Christians. We transcribe the following sentences :

"How should we wish to know, if we did not know, what occupied that evening!" (the same night in which our Lord was betrayed.) "If we have had a friend, a brother, who has died away from us, do we not inquire with intensest interest, what passed in the closing hours of life? what he did last, before the agonies of death withdrew his attention from external things? His latest care, his final conversation, whom did it regard, and what was it about? Do we not know the thrill of sensibility, with which we hear, or wish to hear some reference to ourselves, in the dying accents of one we love? The Saviour's last care, his latest occupation, before he entered the final conflict with the powers of darkness, was to dictate words for us—to establish for us a sacramental rite—an external ordinance—a ceremony—can we believe it? which we neglect, or perform with indifference, or perhaps have never yet performed at all. It was no time to be occupied with things indifferent, with a matter that does not signify, in which we may do as we like, something that can safely be put off or let alone. If Satan has ever told us so, let this question sink deep into our hearts, was it a moment for the Son of God to occupy himself with what it is not necessary for Christians to observe?"—pp. 53, 54.

FEMALE BIOGRAPHY.

1. *Memorials of a Beloved Friend; or a Brief Sketch of the Life of Mary Napier Lincolne. By Elizabeth Ritchie. With an Introductory Essay by Mrs. Henderson.* pp. xvi. 152. 12mo. cloth. Jackson and Walford, London.
2. *The Youthful Sufferer Rejoicing: a Memoir of Miss Edith Luke. By S. J. Wilkins. With an Introduction by the Rev. John Blackburn, of Claremont Chapel.* pp. xii. 120. 18mo. cloth. Ward and Co. London.
3. *Loveliness in Life and Peace in Death, exemplified in a Memoir of Miss Elizabeth Pyer, of South Molton. To which is appended a Sermon, preached on the Evening of her Interment. By George Smith.* pp. iv. 122. 18mo. cloth. William Ball, London.

CHRISTIAN biography has ever been regarded as an important means of usefulness; contributing, in a happy degree, to the formation of the principles and improvement of the character of the rising generation. Female biography, especially that of eminent Christians, cannot fail to be instrumental in promoting the best interests of its readers: we have, therefore, peculiar pleasure in presenting to parents three unusually interesting volumes of this class. These three memoirs afford striking illustrations of the loveliness of religion, and they supply the most convincing evidence of the power and glory of the gospel of Christ. They are admirably suitable for presents to young persons.

Miss Lincolne was born at Halesworth, in Suffolk, Jan. 19, 1818, and died June 11, 1837, "aged nineteen years and nearly five months." Her self-dedication to the God of her parents, when about eleven years of age, her progress in learning, wisdom, and vital godliness, and her triumphant departure to the presence of her Saviour, are beautifully described and illustrated, rendering the volume one of the most instructive that has ever fallen into our hands to read. The work is enriched by a valuable "Introduction" from the elegant pen of Mrs. Henderson.

Miss Luke, a sister of the Rev. Mr. Luke, of Chester, was born in London, June 27, 1818, died Feb. 28, 1836, aged nearly eighteen years. Her early

piety, and its maturity under long affliction, with her joyful departure to the world of glory, are described in this little volume with great simplicity. The testimonials to the character of this young saint are most satisfactory in the introductory remarks of her pastor, Mr. Blackburn.

Miss Pyer was born at Bristol, July 4, 1816, and finished her mortal pilgrimage, Jan. 26, 1837, in the twenty-first year of her age. Her early piety was indicated before she was ten years old, and her progressive advancement in the divine life, until her blissful removal to the world of spirits, are sketched with much perspicuity and beauty.

The Student's Manual: designed, by specific Directions to aid in forming and strengthening the Intellectual and Moral Character and Habits of the Student. By John Todd, Pastor of the first Congregational Church, Philadelphia. 12mo. cloth. London: Simpkin, Marshall, and Co.

THIS invaluable work, of which we have already given a sincere and cordial recommendation, is now published in a neat but economical form, at the low price of three shillings. We wish that every theological student and Sunday-school teacher throughout the empire were in possession of a copy.

The Juvenile Scrap Book. By Mrs. Ellis, Author of "The Women of England"—for 1840. London: Fisher and Co.

We rejoice that this annual, which for the number and beauty of its graphic illustrations must be a great favourite with young people, is placed under the editorial care of Mrs. Ellis, who happily possesses a mind as deeply imbued with high moral and religious sentiment, as it is endowed with the lofty imaginings of poetical genius. Our readers, who wish to present to their young friends an annual which unites pictorial and moral beauty, may safely select this tasteful volume, which contains seventeen engravings, with appropriate illustrations in prose and verse.

Bible Acrostics; or an Acrostical Arrangement, in Prose, of all the leading Facts and Predictions of the Old Testament. By Samuel J. Wilkins, Author of the "Youthful Sufferer Rejoicing," &c. 12mo. cloth. pp. viii. 140. Houlston, London.

MR. WILKINS has displayed unusual ingenuity in the arrangement of a large mass of valuable matter in this volume, which is likely to be useful in the exercises of the young on scripture history. "Besides," says he, in the preface, "being a 'help to the memory,' and as such the author would fondly hope likely to be exceedingly useful, the 'Bible Acrostics' will be found very serviceable as a 'companion' in the perusal of the Old Testament. For if prior to the study of the history of any whose lives are recorded in this portion of the Sacred Oracles, the concise yet full account here given of them be read over with attention, a general knowledge of circumstances would in a few minutes be obtained, curiosity on many points would be awakened, and the original and more lengthened history subsequently read with additional interest and profit."

THE EDITOR'S TABLE.

Christian Duties in the various Relations of Life. By T. Lewis, Islington. 12mo. Ward and Co.

The Life of Marcus Tullius Cicero. By J. F. Hollings. 12mo. Thomas Tegg.

Youthful Piety Exemplified in the last Illness and Death of Ann Cletheroe, aged Fourteen Years and Eight Months. By the Rev. J. Cotterill. 12mo. L. and G. Seeley.

Primitive Christianity; or the Ancient and Catholic Faith of Apostolical Christians. By the Rev. John Gossner. Translated from the German. The Religious Tract Society. 18mo.

The Religion of Protestants, a safe Way to Salvation. By William Chillingworth, M.A. In two volumes, 12mo. Religious Tract Society.

The Guide of the Hebrew Student, containing an Epitome of Sacred History, together with Easy Passages in pure Biblical Hebrew, selected from Hebrew School-books most approved and extensively used in Germany. Edited, with additional Keys and Glossary, adapted for English Learners, by Herman Hedwig. 8vo. J. W. Parker.

Pagan Rome, translated from the French. The Religious Tract Society. 18mo.

The Autobiography of Thomas Platter, a Schoolmaster of the Sixteenth Century. Translated from the German by the Translator of Lavater's Original Maxims. B. Wertheim.

The Redeemer. A Poem. By W. Howorth. 8vo. Charles Tilt,

The Fear of God. By John Bunyan. The Religious Tract Society, London. Geography of the Bible; or some Account of the Countries and Places mentioned in Holy Scripture. The Religious Tract Society, London.

Remarks on the Celibacy of the Roman Catholic Clergy. By the Rev. the P. P. of ——. Richard M. Tim, J. Cumming, W. Curry, Jun. and Co. Dublin.

Baptism. The Right of Infants to Baptism; with a Brief Essay on the Mode of Baptizing. By W. Davis, Hastings. W. Diplock, Arundel. 18mo.

The Poetical Works of the Rev. R. Montgomery, A.M. Oxon. London: Ball, Arnold, and Co.

Meditations. Edited by the Rev. J. Missing. London: James Nisbet and Co.

The Early Grave of William Wilks Cooper. Dublin: Hardy and Walker.

Fisher's Drawing Room Scrap-Book for 1840. With Poetical Illustrations. By L. E. L. and Mary Howitt. Elegantly bound, with thirty-six engravings. 4to. Fisher, Son, and Co.

The Life and Services of Horatio Viscount Nelson, &c. From his Lordship's Manuscripts. By the Rev. James S. Clarke, F.R.S. and John M'Arthur, Esq. LL.D. 8vo. First Division, with Portraits, &c. London: Fisher, Son, and Co.

The Juvenile Scrap-Book. By Mrs. Ellis, Author of the Women of England, for 1840. London: Fisher, Son, and Co.

LITERARY INTELLIGENCE.

WORKS IN THE PRESS, OR IN PROGRESS.

Biblical Topography.—Lectures on the Position and Character of the Places of Scripture, with maps. By Samuel Ransom, Classical and Hebrew Tutor in Hackney Theological Seminary. With a Preface by John Harris, D.D.

The Sideral Heavens; and other subjects connected with Astronomy. By Thos. Dick, LL.D. Author of "Celestial Scenery," and intended as a Companion to that work.

The Pagan Altar and Jehovah's Temple. By the Rev. R. Weaver.

A Volume of Sermons by the Rev. Archibald Douglas, more than forty years Pastor of the Church at Broad Street, Reading. With a Memoir by the Rev. George Clayton.

TRANSACTIONS OF THE CONGREGATIONAL CHURCHES, AT HOME AND ABROAD.

MEETING OF THE CONGREGATIONAL UNION OF ENGLAND AND WALES.

AN autumnal meeting of the "Congregational Union of England and Wales," adjourned from the annual meeting in May last, at the Congregational Library, London, for the special purpose of considering the question of HOME MISSIONS, took place at Birmingham during the past month. The meetings commenced on Tuesday evening, the 8th, and closed on Thursday evening, the 10th of October, and included various public religious services, together with more private conferences, the leading features of which we shall now lay before our readers.

TUESDAY EVENING, OCTOBER 8.

At half-past six the proceedings were commenced by a public religious service in Carr's Lane Chapel.

The Rev. Thomas James, of Woolwich, gave out the 67th Psalm.

The Rev. J. Hunt, of Brixton, read the Scriptures and engaged in prayer.

After singing, the Rev. Robert Ainslie, Secretary of the London City Mission, also offered prayer.

The Rev. J. A. James ascended the pulpit, and addressed the assembly as follows:—"Dr. Raffles, the President of the last annual meeting of the Congregational Union, held in London in May, will now take the presidency of this adjourned meeting. And he comes before you this evening, after a long public service held this day at Derby, in which he bore a leading part. I mention this circumstance, if it be necessary, which, however, I am sure it is not, that an apology should be made for him, for, what I am convinced will be matter of regret if it should happen,—rather more brevity than we wish.

The Rev. Dr. RAFFLES then said:—My christian friends! we live in an age of unprecedented exertion, of christian enterprise, beyond that of any former period. I apprehend that about this there can be no question; never were there such societies as at present exist; never were there such contributions to the christian cause as are now made; never was there such a vast amount of agency at work, such an almost infinite variety of moral machinery employed as in the present day. It seems as though it were beyond the power of human ingenuity to invent any new society, or any novel mode of doing good, or to discover any new department or scene of christian effort, which has not been already explored, and, in some measure, at least, occupied and cultivated. In this respect, perhaps, the divisions and subdivisions of the christian church into many sects and parties, otherwise to be deplored, may be a matter of great advantage; for thus has been secured a division of labour; a constant stimulus has been furnished to exertion, and each individual section of the christian church has been kept in holy and active operation by observing the activity of all the rest. Yet, great as the efforts of the present day are, confessedly great in comparison with the supineness and indifference of past ages, though the christian church seems to be at length awake and alive, in some happy measure, to a sense of her responsibility, her resources, her capacities, and to the great and glorious enterprise that lies before her; though she is now compassing sea and land to make proselytes, and stretching forth the arms of her benevolence and love from America to China, from Britain to Japan; yet, still, these efforts are nothing,

literally and truly nothing, in comparison with the world's necessities; nothing in comparison with the capacities and the responsibilities of the christian church, (for her capacity, be it remembered, is the measure of her responsibility); nothing in comparison with the claims, even of our own highly-favoured, yet still but partially enlightened and evangelized country. Am I not justified in applying these epithets, but *partially enlightened and evangelized*, to Britain? Am I not justified in applying these epithets to her, even at this the brightest period of her history? Am I not justified by the affecting consideration, that at this hour a darkness, as thick and palpable as that which broods on heathen lands, presses on mighty masses of her population, not only in the thickly-populated manufacturing districts, but throughout her rural and more retired scenes? Am I not justified in the application of these epithets, by the fact that not one-sixth of her population, even at this day, are in the habit of attending the public worship of Almighty God? Am I not justified by the melancholy fact, that in the metropolis of our country, while there are but 600 places of religious worship, there are 6,000 of those sources, and sinks, and dens of iniquity and crime, whence issue forth those intoxicating liquors that still more deeply debase and brutalize the people, and sweep them away by scores, and hundreds, and thousands, to the drunkard's grave?

But even though, in respect of christian effort, we had all that we could wish; even though the instrumentality at work were fully adequate to our country's claims and the world's necessities; even though our ministers, and missionaries, and evangelists, and teachers, and messengers of mercy of various kinds could surpass in number, in activity, in talent, in diligence, in zeal, all the emissaries of Satan and the ministers of sin, and the priests and abettors of idolatry, and infidelity, and popery; and even though the contributions of the christian church should be fully adequate to their support, and to the furnishing books and other things requisite in order to the success of their noble enterprise; yet still something would be wanting above and beyond all this, without which all this would be of no avail. What is that? The eternal God has himself announced it. "Thus saith the Lord, I will yet, for this, be enquired of by the house of Israel to do it for them." What was he to do for them? He was to rebuild the waste places, and people the desolations of former times, and to cause her cities to be inhabited by flocks and men. He had proposed to do it; he had promised to do it; he was ready to do it; he would certainly do it, for he had pledged himself to it; yet he could not do it, but in answer to the prayers of this people. "Yet for this will I be enquired of by the house of Israel to do it for them." And it is so at the present day; his purpose with regard to Israel is his purpose with regard to us. He will pour out abundantly the influences of his Holy Spirit on a parched and perishing world, that the desert may rejoice and blossom as the rose. And I cannot but entertain a cheering hope that he has a glorious revival of religion in store, even for our own beloved country. But, then, it must be in answer to the fervent, the impassioned, the persevering prayers of his people, if he causes the heavens to open, and the showers to drop down in fatness on the thirsty soil; and then the wilderness and the solitary place shall be glad, and the desert, even throughout our own beloved country, shall blossom as the rose. Do you ask why this is the case, why God has determined to grant the blessing only in answer to prayer? Is it because he needs to be informed, by our prayers, of the state of the case? Is it that our prayers must put him in possession of the facts, and make him wiser than he is? Oh no. He knows what things we have need of before we ask him, whether for ourselves or others, and is better acquainted with the world's condition and the world's necessities than we can possibly be. Is it that he is reluctant to bless, and requires the importunity of our supplications to move him from his purposes of vengeance to those of compassion and of grace? Ah, no! He is "waiting to be gracious," more ready to bless than we are to ask, to confer the boon than we are to solicit the blessing; it is because he has a purpose to bless that we are encouraged to pray.

He is "waiting to be gracious;" waiting for our prayers. He has urged us to give him no rest, but we have not so importuned him yet. He says, "concerning my sons, and the work of my hands, command ye me;" but we have not commanded him yet. He waits to be proved by the fervent intensity of our supplications, but we have not proved him so yet. "The kingdom of heaven suffereth violence, and the violent take it by storm;" but we have not so taken it yet. It is because we restrain prayer that the blessing is delayed. Only let us ask, and we shall receive; let us seek, and we shall find, and then our joy shall be full.

My brethren, God has determined to bestow the blessing only in answer to prayer, that we may have our entire dependence upon him continually in view; that it may be ever present to our minds. What are we without God? What can we do without God? Absolutely nothing. We live in his smile, we perish in his frown; and in vain are all our efforts to promote his glory, unless he command the influence which alone can ensure success. Only try; put forth your best and most vigorous efforts; arrange the most wise and judicious plans; employ the best adapted agents; present the largest possible contributions; watch over the working of your system with sleepless vigilance, year after year; let Paul plant, let Apollos water, let Wesley plan, let Whitfield preach; let there be eloquence, and zeal, and faithfulness, and fervour, and diligence, and devotedness, unsurpassed even in apostolic times, and no good will result, no harvest will reach us, no fruit be gathered; all will be stagnant, torpid, dead, if God withhold the influence which alone can ensure success. And he will withhold it if we think we can do without it; he will withhold it so long as we imagine that we do not require it; he will withhold it till we are made to feel that we cannot do without it; he will withhold it till we discover our radical mistake, and, deeply humbled and abased before him on account of it, flee to his throne, and cast ourselves upon his mercy. My brethren! vigorous efforts and fervent prayers, judicious plans and earnest entreaties, should go together; they should never be separate. Yet, if there must be, *if there must be* failure and deficiency any where, rather let it be in the wisdom of the plans than in the fervour of the prayers. For while we hold on by God, in simple dependence upon him, and fervent supplication for his Spirit and aid, he can work by the weakest instruments, and render the most imperfect plans effectual; while, if we thus restrain prayer before him, and proudly refuse to acknowledge him, he can confound and make of none effect the wisest arrangements, and render abortive the most zealous and vigorous efforts. Thus he will confound the wisdom of the wise, and will bring to nought the understanding of the prudent, that no flesh may glory in his presence, but, according as it is written, "he that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord."

But, brethren, while such is the fixed and unalterable purpose of God with regard to this matter, have we not every encouragement to pray? Yes, every ground of encouragement we can possibly desire. We have it in his command, enforced and illustrated by the ministry and example of our Lord, "That men ought always to pray, and not to faint." And has he not given us a model and pattern by which we are to arrange all our supplications? Was he not himself—the blessed Redeemer—a man of prayer? The deserts and the mountains witnessed the fervour of his prayers; and often, after a day occupied in labour, the livelong night was spent by him in the fervour and agony of intense and impassioned intercessions, pouring out his strong cries and tears; and he was heard in that hour. Have we not every ground of encouragement in his intercession? While we supplicate on earth, he pleads in heaven, presents his hands and his feet, exhibits the scars left by his enemies, appeals to the preciousness of his blood, and the infinite value of his atoning sacrifice for sin. Aye, and the Redeemer himself must pray, if he would receive the full recompense of his mediatorial toil, and see of the travail of his soul, and be fully satisfied. "Ask of me," says God, "ask of me, and I will give unto thee the heathen for thine inheritance, and the uttermost parts of the earth for thy

possession." Oh, while we ask upon earth, while the united church gives God no rest day or night, if Jesus asks in heaven, appealing to the scenes of his suffering, his agony, and his bloody sweat, will not the ear and the heart of God be opened to the continued supplications of heaven and of earth, of the Redeemer and the redeemed, and the glorious visions of ancient prophecy be realised, and the knowledge of the Lord cover the earth as the waters cover the sea? And then, while the Redeemer maketh intercession *for* us, the Spirit maketh intercession *in* us, inspiring, exciting, enkindling, stirring up within us those ardent and intense desires for which the language of men has no terms and epithets sufficiently strong, the "groanings that cannot be uttered," that enter the ear of the Lord God of Sabaoth, and command the showers of blessing which he has prepared to pour down upon his waiting people. And have we not every encouragement to pray, christian brethren, in the experience of the saints in all ages, and the history of the church in past times? Oh what wonderful manifestations of the divine presence and the divine power have been made in answer to prayer! "I beseech thee," saith Moses, "I beseech thee, show me thy glory," and, in answer to the prayer of Moses, the Lord bowed his heavens and came down, "and he passed by before him, and he proclaimed the name of the Lord, the Lord God, gracious and merciful, pardoning iniquity, transgression, and sin." Elias was a man of prayer, and, in answer to his fervent supplications, the little cloud arose in the far distant horizon, of the bigness of a man's hand, and quickly spread over the entire face of the heavens, and poured down showers of fruitfulness and plenty upon the parched and thirsty soil. It was while the disciples were assembled in united, fervent, and persevering supplications in the upper room in Jerusalem, that the very foundations of the building were shaken, and a noise of a mighty rushing wind was heard in the midst of the assembly, and there appeared unto them cloven tongues like as of fire, and rested upon each of them, and they spake with tongues as the Spirit gave them utterance, and thus furnished with miraculous gifts to arrest the attention of mankind to the message which they were about to unfold, they went forth to preach the unsearchable riches of Christ to the utmost ends of the then known and discovered world. Aye, and it was while the Redeemer prayed, that the fashion of his countenance was altered, and his raiment became white and glistening, and such beamings of his godhead burst forth from the veil of his humanity, that his astonished disciples wist not what they said, such was their ecstasy, and they cried, "Master, it is good for us to be here."

Oh, when I see such an assembly as this, convened, as I presume you are, for the special purpose of prayer; when I see that it is one amongst the arrangements of this momentous meeting, that we should first unite in fervent supplications to the throne of the heavenly grace; when, as I trust, I am warranted to do, I take this assembly as a pledge of the spirit of prayer which is about to be poured out on the churches of our beloved country; when I entertain the delightful assurance, as I hope I may, that while we are assembled in solemn deliberation, christian friends and brethren throughout the length and breadth of our island, will implore God that his blessing may be with us, and will importune the heavenly grace for the Spirit of wisdom, and power, and might to descend on us, that we may devise wise, and well-adapted, and well-ordered plans, and have the energy to carry those plans into effect,—I am exceedingly rejoiced,—I anticipate a happy issue to this solemn meeting, and I cannot but entertain a delightful assurance that hallowed results will ensue that will be felt in future generations and far distant scenes. I cannot but regard the meeting now to be holden in this town, as one of the most important, if not the most, ever held, in connection with our churches, not in Birmingham merely, but in any of the towns of our beloved country. For if the result of this meeting should be an efficient plan for the evangelizing of our own native land, each individual converted to God by his special blessing, in connection with the operations of this plan, will be an advocate for the

missionary cause, multitudes will be missionaries themselves, and Britain, thus prepared for the mighty enterprise, will go forth with America, "fair as the moon, bright as the sun, and terrible as an army with banners," to win the nations to the sceptre of Messiah, until he sways that sceptre from east to west, from north to south, and all the tribes and kingdoms of earth's vast family unite to celebrate his praise, and crown him Lord of all!

At the close of the above animated appeal, which was heard with almost breathless attention,

The Rev. ALGERNON WELLS, one of the Secretaries, being called upon for that purpose, addressed the congregation to the following effect:—I cannot do more, said he, at present, than offer a very few sentences of explanation; our time will not permit a lengthened speech. Nevertheless, we have come to your town, we have asked your hospitalities, we have begged of you accommodation for our deliberative assembly, and, what is more important than either, we have begged your prayers, and now it is highly proper that we should offer explanations to you of the reason and intent of these proceedings. It is quite impossible for me now to explain to you at large the constitution and proceedings of the Congregational Union of England and Wales. Union is a delightful word, because union is a delightful thing; for to have our hearts linked together in love, to have an agreement in our views of truth and duty, will make us happy, and make us strong in the service of God. The Congregational Union has been set up, my christian friends, by the lovers of union. The intent of it was not to supply a deficiency in oneness of view upon the great truths of the gospel and the principles of theology among us. We rejoice that, at this hour, by the favour of God, we have reason to believe that our pastors and churches are of one mind and of one heart upon the great truths of salvation, and we are satisfied with our denomination in this respect; but we are not without a measure of anxious watching and prayer that this inheritance of truth may be preserved by us, and handed down to posterity unimpaired. Neither has this Congregational Union been established to supply a supposed lack of affection and union among our churches and pastors. May God ever keep us from a spirit of security and boasting; but, nevertheless, we do hope that the hearts of our pastors and churches are bound together by a bond of affection as strong as exists in any other community of Christians, whatever greater appearance of combination and oneness they may present to the world. Those who travel at all among our churches, whether to bear part in public services, or to participate in the hospitalities of our christian friends in private, know what a oneness of affection there is among us, in which we rejoice, yea, and will rejoice. And may the great Spirit of love and peace keep far away from us jealousies, and heart-burnings, and roots of bitterness. Neither, again, has this Congregational Union been formed and furthered for the sake of secluding the Congregational churches from other denominations and churches, and separating it from fellowship with the church catholic. So far from this, one of the objects contemplated in its formation was, that by means of such an organization, it might be possible for us to gain a representation which, in the name of all our churches, might hold out the right hand of fraternal affection, and communion to evangelical communities of Christians of every name and of every form. But those who have been concerned in the formation and management of this Congregational Union, having looked with deep anxiety upon the constitution of our churches, their liberty, their right each within itself to manage entirely all its own affairs, and, while endeavouring to pay a sacred regard to its liberty and its rights, so as in no instance to invade or infringe upon them, have still hoped that it was possible to unite our churches together for certain great and common objects, both as between ourselves and in respect of the world and the church at large, and to get, in short, the strength of union without losing the privilege of liberty. To compass this object we have looked about for plans, and thought that we had adopted one which would be unexceptionable in the opinion of our brethren, when we took the several county associations, and built upon that

plan, and sought no union closer than that which already existed in respect of counties throughout the nation at large; and, therefore, to avoid the necessity of putting any church to a test of doctrine or discipline, we founded our union on the fellowship of existing associations, and of churches recognized by those associations in their individual capacity, when, in any instance, an entire association might forbear to connect itself with us. Oh, brethren, in the integrity of their hearts, I believe that the Committee and brethren, who have the management of this institution, can say to our ministers and churches, "We are as jealous of our independence and of our rights as any one of our entire fellowship." If you ask me, what, then, do we propose to do? I say, that we wish to exert a healthful action within our own churches, and to effect this object by obtaining the fellowship and co-operation of delegates from various parts of our land for prayer, and counsel, and love. And do not let us imagine that there is no kind of usefulness which is not reducible to some palpable form, either of pounds, shillings, and pence, or some other immediate and visible result. If 300 ministers and brethren meet together, and, after prayer and consultation, separate with a much larger amount of mutual love and common zeal for great objects, then, by their meeting, an immense amount of good has been accomplished that cannot be made palpable. As the heart receives from the extremities the vital stream which, after it has passed through a singular elaboration, is again propelled to those extremities with new vitality and force, promoting health and vigour in the entire frame; so, by an analagous process, do we hope to collect, as it were, the life, the wisdom, and the prayers of the several portions of our body; or that, having effected an intenser and firmer union, they may be dispersed again with increased power and energy over the entire community. We are endeavouring, therefore, to administer a wholesome impulse to our denominational literature, our denominational attachments and regards. Brethren, we cannot but think that we have, in the distinctive opinions of our body, that which is truly scriptural, perfectly accordant with the mind of Christ, and calculated to be highly beneficial, not to ourselves only, but to the entire church. We cannot help feeling a solicitude, not merely that the gospel should spread, but that it should spread in its purest form, in connection with the most scriptural institutions, and in that mode which will best secure and perpetuate its healthful influence. Then, again, we are desirous of accomplishing, and have, indeed, already effected, a fellowship with other communities of Christians. We have sent to them our fraternal delegations; we have received theirs in return. From Scotland, and Ireland, and Wales, and America, we have welcomed among us dearly beloved brethren. We have met, and we have parted in great love; we have felt ourselves, on such occasions, to be the representatives of many thousands of our countrymen; we have beheld in them the representatives of their several fraternities. And I cannot, and I do not believe, that it was ever the will of Jesus Christ that his churches should have no communion more extensive, as churches, than can be attained by any number of believers, who worship God in one building, and are placed under the pastoral oversight of one minister. I do believe that there are large and noble objects to be attained, that there are great purposes to be entertained, great impulses to be felt; that there are expansive affections to be realized, which such a curtailing or confining of our fellowship would not permit, and which can only be expected from such an union as the present. But, then, we are desirous, pre-eminently desirous, that our denomination should spread abroad the gospel, and bear an adequate and conspicuous part in the evangelization of our own country, and of the world; and just at this juncture we have been turning our thoughtful regards to the state of our own beloved country. It is perfectly impossible for any British Christian, whatever his denomination may be, to arrive at a just view of the facts of the case, as it regards our own country at this very hour, without alarm and shame, and an earnest desire to accomplish something more effectual than is already seen to be the result of christian exertion. We have looked at

that share which is borne in present efforts for the religious good of our country, and we cannot come to the conclusion that we are doing what we ought. And now, therefore, after the subject has been long thought of, and long discussed, Providence has guided us to this point, that we should invite an assembly of our pastors and brethren here in Birmingham to pray and consult together as to what our portion of Israel ought to do. Surely every Christian heart would be glad with a joy such as never else will be known on earth, if all the churches of the Redeemer could become one again; but as long as our conscientious differences may render it necessary that we should be divided into several communities, a division which all deplore, while they feel it to be necessary; each section is bound, not only by obligation to Christ, not only for its own personal advantage, but in order to the general good of the church catholic, each community of Christians is bound to maintain itself in the highest state of piety and efficiency that it can attain, and in that way to exercise a beneficial influence on other communities, as well as upon the world. I must say, then, personally, for myself, brethren, as a humble individual, connected, in the providence of God, with these movements, I never felt such a weight of responsibility before in any public proceeding. Looking at the political aspect of our country; looking at the position it occupies amongst the nations of the earth, and the dispositions of heaven towards it; considering the progress that error is making in our land, error in every form, Popery, Infidelity, and Puseyism; considering all these things, I say, the question weighs heavily on our minds, "what are we to do? what ought we to do?" The path is beset with difficulties on every hand. To ascertain in what course we should move, and, when that course is ascertained, to move in it with wisdom, with vigour, in a spirit of prayer and christian charity towards all other denominations, requires a degree of grace which I do not believe we have. I cannot persuade myself that we, or any denomination of Christians, at this hour, are at that high mark, and tone of piety which the case requires at our hands; and therefore should we give ourselves to prayer, that nothing may be further from our thoughts than to press favourite schemes because they are our own. We should ask of God, and take counsel with each other, in order that we may know what we ought to do; and then, acting in this spirit, depending thus in God, if we should excite against us the hostility of our enemies by the course we may eventually take, we should have satisfaction in the integrity of our consciences, in the meekness of Christians, and in the hope of the divine approval; and we should also feel persuaded, that while we bear a faithful testimony to the truth as it is in Jesus, we may leave all the consequences to him. Now it cannot but afford great gratification and encouragement to us, that we are so cordially welcomed on this occasion by the christian brethren of this important and influential town; that the pastors and members of the christian churches here have stretched forth the right hand of christian fellowship to us, and that we are amongst you in love and peace. You will pray, we will consult and pray too; and may the great Author of wisdom and grace pour upon us his influence, excite our compassions, and guide our consultations. For, indeed, there is, through the length and breadth of our land, such a destitution of piety, and such a need for effort, that we must no longer be inactive; and probably our activity may induce very many to live to God, who have hitherto neglected him, and from this meeting in Birmingham there may hereafter be dated a period of activity, vigour, and success in home missions, missions amongst our brethren and countrymen, such as will command our lasting gratitude, and tell with power upon the world around.

The Rev. JOHN KELLY, of Liverpool, then proposed the following resolution, embodying the sentiments of that assembly and the Congregational Body generally: in reference to the Congregational Union.

"That the statement now laid before this meeting, by the Rev. Algernon Wells, of the constitution, design, and operations of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, is eminently satisfactory, as proving, that while that

body presents a noble instance of voluntary and comprehensive association, it violates neither the rights of private judgment, nor infringes upon the independence of individual churches; and, at the same time, demonstrates the vast importance of the Institution, as tending, by the blessing of God, to increase the harmony, the strength, and the efficiency of the denomination which it represents—objects at all times important, but especially so in the present age, when the strife of parties is so fierce; and, on the other hand, when such efforts are made for the more entire evangelization of our country, our colonies, and the world.”

I will not (said the Rev. Gentleman) attempt to support the resolution which I have just moved for your adoption, believing that it is one which commends itself at once to the judgment of all present. Neither is it my part to offer any eulogy on the statement which has just been submitted to you by my esteemed friend and brother, Mr. Wells. I feel convinced, however, that that statement must equally have commended itself to all as eminently satisfactory. It might, indeed, have been more so; not as to the manner in which that statement has been presented before you, but as to the facts to which that statement refers. The principle of association has already been extended to our denomination in part, and for various objects, and for the success obtained up to the present moment, we have reason to believe we are indebted to the blessing of God in connexion with the spirit of fraternal love and fellowship which has so eminently characterized all who belong to our Union. But we do trust that a far more satisfactory state of things will be brought about, when all our churches are moved by the same spirit of fraternal affection, as well as exercising a like dependance upon the Spirit of God. I long to see the day when we shall enjoy close and intimate communion among all the churches of our denomination. That the principles on which our churches rest are scriptural, and therefore possess an eminent superiority over all other principles of ecclesiastical polity, we do not, we cannot doubt; to them we owe not a little of the purity, peace, and vigour which God has been pleased to grant us; and yet I do candidly acknowledge, that, looking at the word of God, observing the prominence given to union in the pages of the New Testament, and the approval which God has evidently been pleased to manifest towards it, I should be very much disposed to question the scriptural character of the principles on which our churches are founded, if these principles really and truly stood in the way of an effective union for the accomplishment of the great purposes of the gospel. I feel convinced that there is nothing whatever in these principles which can stand in the way of a thorough and affectionate combination of all the churches of Christ—a combination mainly for counsel and for co-operation—a combination which is not an exercise of authority which the word of God has not sanctioned, but a combination which, on many accounts, is desirable, and may operate in many ways, promoting our own spiritual prosperity, and, through the influence of grace and holiness, promoting the spiritual benefit of our country. At all times is such a combination desirable, but it is especially so at present. It is demanded, I apprehend, by a regard for our own character. The world judges of men as it does of individuals, by what they do, what they do in their capacity as churches, and as a denomination; and it ever has appeared to be one means of making a great impression upon the minds of our countrymen, to associate our churches together for the attainment of common objects connected with the propagation of the gospel. The truth is, that a large portion of our efficiency as churches has been secured by our co-operation in a limited and partial degree. When combinations have already existed in particular localities, they have been productive of the best result to ministers and churches, and of great benefit to the world; and I apprehend that I am warranted by the result of the experience already within our observation, in saying, that had that union been more general and more complete, it would have been far more efficient; it would have been attended with results far greater than we have the happiness at

present to perceive. The present times, however, call, and call loudly, for more thorough combination, more perfect union. We are, in some respects, driven to it. There is an allusion in the resolution to the strife of parties, none can regret more than I do that strife; none can feel more keenly and deeply than I do the evil consequences of the state of things to which reference is made. One of the consequences of that state of things is, that it almost of necessity prevents the members of Christ's church from acting as a body. We cannot now anticipate such a co-operation with others as is desirable for the accomplishment of the great object which we all ought to have in view; and I feel satisfied, from the very existence of such a state of things, that we shall be far more likely to accomplish that object by a thorough, full, and comprehensive union among ourselves, than we possibly can by waiting till the strife has ceased, in order to act together with those who might hereafter desire it. If we give way till the season for action is past, we shall in the mean time, incur all the guilt which the neglect of a positive duty involves. And then, again, the state of things, not only in our own country, but in the colonies and the whole world, seems most imperatively to demand that we should strengthen ourselves and the cause which we have at heart by combination, that we may exert, to the utmost extent, the engines which we possess to spread the gospel and to advance the Redeemer's kingdom. I feel that I should be most unduly trespassing on the patience of this assembly, did I continue any longer to address you, and therefore I will conclude by most cordially proposing the resolution which has already been submitted to your attention.

The Rev. Dr. MATHESON, of Wolverhampton, in seconding the resolution, observed, that he rejoiced in the statement which had been made to the meeting by Mr. Wells, and also entirely agreed in the sentiments which had been expressed by his friend (Mr. Kelly) in moving the resolution.

The resolution thus moved and seconded was then put by the Chairman to the meeting, and carried unanimously.

The Rev. TIMOTHY EAST then said, I beg leave now to move—

“That the Congregational churches in Birmingham, and their pastors, duly appreciate the honour conferred upon them, in having their town selected in which to hold the adjourned Provincial Meeting of the Congregational Union; and they welcome the esteemed and beloved brethren who may be present on the interesting occasion; earnestly praying that such benefits may result from the convocation, in the way of affectionate intercourse, augmented confidence, and well-matured plans of extended usefulness, as shall render this season of hallowed intercourse not only delightful on its own account, but a model and a motive to others that may follow.”

The reading of this resolution is all that this meeting will expect from me.

The Rev. J. A. JAMES, in seconding the above, spoke as follows:—I most cordially second the resolution which has just been read, to every sentiment of which my mind and my heart respond. I bid you welcome, my beloved and honoured brethren, to this town. I rejoice that I have lived to see the day when I am surrounded by so many of those with whom in other places and on other occasions, I have taken sweet counsel. May our meeting be agreeable to ourselves; may it be useful to our denomination, beneficial to our country, and conducive even to the happiness of the world. Though no visible token of the divine presence be with us, no audible sound heard, yet may He that walketh amid the golden candlesticks, that holds the stars in his hands, shed upon us all such an influence, that we shall not doubt that He is indeed here. May He create upon Mount Zion, her dwelling places, and her assemblies, a cloud and a smoke by day, and the shining light of a flame by night. May we be baptized into one spirit,—every thing like vain glory and self-sufficiency being expelled,—and, with one mind and one heart, we may go to the business which in Divine Providence is assigned to us, and this meeting, by its results, be among the most precious reminiscences upon earth, and the most grateful and joyful recollections when we have reached our heavenly home, and are spending eternal ages together

after the fashion of this world hath passed away. And again, therefore, in my own name, and in the name of my own church, and in the name of all the Christians of our denomination in Birmingham, I bid you welcome on this occasion.

The resolution was then carried by a unanimous show of hands, after which the Chairman said,—I now trust I may be permitted as the President, and in the name of my honoured brethren assembled on this occasion, gratefully to acknowledge the kind sentiments which that resolution has expressed, and the cordial welcome which it has addressed to us on our arrival in Birmingham.

"Praise God from whom all blessings flow," was then sung, the Rev. D. E. Ford engaged in prayer, and the assembly was dismissed.

MEETING FOR CONFERENCE, AT CARR'S LANE SCHOOL-ROOM.

The following ministers and laymen connected with the Union assembled at 9 o'clock on Wednesday morning, October 9, in the school-room of Carr's Lane Chapel.

BERKS.

Rev. W. Legg, *Reading* || Rev. Henry Addiscott, *Maidenhead*

BUCKS.

Rev. D. Aston, *Buckingham* || Rev. R.G. Jameson, *Great Horwood*

CHESHIRE.

Rev. James Turner, *Knutsford* || Rev. James Cooper, *Middlewich*

DERBY.

Rev. J. Gawthorne, *Derby*

DEVON.

Rev. R. Kent, *Barnstaple* || Sam. Evans, Esq. *St. Mary Ottery*
Rev. George Smith, *Plymouth* || John Horsey, Esq. *Ditto*
Rev. William Wright, *Honiton*

DORSET.

John Brown, Esq. *Wareham* || Malachi Fisher, Esq. *Blandford*

ESSEX.

Rev. Robert Burls, *Maldon* || W. C. Wells, Esq. *Chelmsford*
R.W. Dixon, Esq. *Wickham Bishops* || Rev. J. J. Freeman, *Walthamstow*

GLOUCESTER.

Rev. John Burder, M.A. *Stroud* || Rev. Jerome Clapp, *Dursley*
Rev. Thomas Edkins, *Nailsworth*

HANTS.

Rev. D. E. Ford, *Lyminster.*

KENT.

Rev. Thomas Timpson, *Lewisham* || Rev. Thomas James, *Woolwich*
Rev. H. F. Rooke, *Faversham*

LANCASTER.

Rev. Samuel Nichol, *Darwin* || Mr. Thomas Barnes, *Halshaw Moor*
Rev. T. Raffles, D.D. *Liverpool* || Rev. R. Fletcher, *Manchester*
Rev. Joseph Dyson, *Halshaw Moor* || Rev. John L. Poore, *Ditto*
Rev. John Kelly, *Liverpool* || Rev. Robert Halley, D.D. *Ditto*
Rev. J. Clunie, LL.D. *Manchester* || Mr. W. White, *Liverpool*
Rev. Wm. Blackburn, *Bamford* || William Kay, Esq. *Ditto*
George Hatfield, Esq. *Manchester* || Mr. S. Blackburn, *Ditto*
Mr. C. Robertson, *Liverpool*

LEICESTER.

Rev. William Salt, *Hinckley* || Rev. Jas. Buckfitt, *Castle Donington*
Rev. J. Roberts, *Melton Mowbray* || Thomas Nunueley, Esq. *Leicester*

MIDDLESEX.

Rev. John Robinson, <i>London</i>	Rev. G. Evans, <i>Mile End</i>
Rev. J. Woodwork, <i>Ditto</i>	Rev. Algernon Wells, <i>Clapton</i>
Rev. J. Fletcher, D.D. <i>Stepney</i>	Rev. Robert Ainslie, <i>London</i>
Rev. John Moreland, <i>Totteridge</i>	Rev. Thomas Binney <i>Ditto</i>
Rev. John Blackburn, <i>Pentonville</i>	Rev. J. Leifchild, D.D. <i>Ditto</i>
Rev. W. S. Palmer, <i>London</i>	Joshua Wilson, Esq. <i>Highbury</i>
Mr. Josiah Conder <i>Ditto</i>	Mr. James Dinnis, <i>London</i>
Mr. J. Peachey <i>Ditto</i>	Mr. J. H. Tooke <i>Ditto</i>
Mr. James Smith <i>Ditto</i>	Mr. P. Jackson <i>Ditto</i>
Mr. George Gull <i>Ditto</i>	Benj. Hanbury, Esq. <i>Ditto</i>
Thomas Piper, Esq. <i>Ditto</i>	Mr. Joseph Dawson <i>Ditto</i>
Mr. Samuel Morley, <i>Hackney</i>	Mr. James Spicer <i>Ditto</i>

MONMOUTH.

Rev. D. Byron, *Newport*

NORTHAMPTON.

Rev. T. Milner, M.A. <i>Northampton</i>	Rev. Benjamin Hobson, <i>Welford</i>
Rev. Geo. Taylor, <i>Wellingborough</i>	Mr. Joseph Betts, jun. <i>Northampton</i>

NOTTINGHAM.

Rev. R. Weaver, <i>Mansfield</i>	Mr. Thomas Herbert, <i>Nottingham</i>
Rev. Joseph Gilbert, <i>Nottingham</i>	Mr. S. Thurman, jun. <i>Ditto</i>

NORTHUMBERLAND.

Rev. Archibald Jack, <i>North Shields</i>	Rev. D. D. Evans, <i>Newcastle-on-Tyne</i>
---	--

OXFORDSHIRE.

Rev. J. Rowland, <i>Henley-on-Thames</i>	J. D. Goodchild, Esq. <i>Henley</i>
--	-------------------------------------

SALOP.

Rev. J. T. Mandeno, <i>Wem</i>	Rev. William Reeve, <i>Oswestry</i>
Rev. Thomas Weaver, <i>Shrewsbury</i>	Rev. Joseph Pattison, <i>Wem</i>
Rev. F. Barton, <i>Market Drayton</i>	

SOMERSET.

Rev. H. J. Roper, <i>Bristol</i>	H. O. Wills, Esq. <i>Bristol</i>
----------------------------------	----------------------------------

STAFFORD.

Rev. Joseph Mather, <i>Bilston</i>	Rev. J. C. Galloway, <i>Westbromwich</i>
Rev. Owen Owen, <i>Tipton</i>	Rev. W. F. Buck, <i>Burton-on-Trent</i>
Rev. J. Matheson, D.D. <i>Wolverhampton</i>	Rev. John Hudson, <i>Westbromwich</i>
Rev. John Hammond, <i>Handsworth</i>	Rev. Ed. Gatley, <i>Litchfield</i>
Rev. Robert Goshawk, <i>Leek</i>	Rev. S. Jackson, <i>Walsall</i>
Rev. Joseph Fletcher, <i>Handley</i>	Rev. John Herbert, <i>Abbots Bromley</i>
	Mr. James Baker, <i>Wolverhampton</i>

SUFFOLK.

Rev. J. Smith, *Hasketon*.

SURREY.

Rev. J. Hunt, <i>Brixton</i>	John Dawson, Esq. <i>Kingston</i>
Rev. Robert Aston, <i>Putney</i>	

SUSSEX.

Rev. James Edwards, <i>Brighton</i>	Rev. T. O. Dobbin, B.A. <i>Arundel</i>
-------------------------------------	--

XII

WARWICK.

Rev. J. A. James, *Birmingham*
 Rev. Timothy East, *Ditto*
 Rev. A. E. Pearce *Ditto*
 Rev. Benjamin Brook *Ditto*
 Rev. Peter Sibree *Ditto*
 Rev. R. Richards *Ditto*
 Rev. John Richards *Ditto*
 Rev. J. Hooper *Ditto*
 Rev. James Alsop *Ditto*
 Rev. W. Hood, *Solihull*
 Mr. Thomas Salmon, *Coleshill*

Rev. T. B. Barker, *Spring Hill Coll.*
 Rev. Francis Watts *Ditto*
 Rev. Henry Rogers *Ditto*
 Mr. Abraham Salt, *Birmingham*
 Mr. James James *Ditto*
 Rev. Thomas Dix, *Bedworth*
 Rev. John Sibree, *Coventry*
 Rev. James Gouge, *Polesworth*
 Rev. John Britton, *Kenilworth*
 Rev. R. M. Miller, *Atherstone*
 Rev. John Gregg Hewlett, *Coventry*

WILTS.

Rev. Richard Elliott, *Devizes*

WORCESTER.

Rev. G. Redford, DD LL.D. *Worcester*
 Rev. James Dawson, *Dudley*

Rev. James Richards, *Stourbridge*
 Mr. John Whitehouse, *Dudley*

YORK.

Rev. Thomas Scales, *Leeds*
 Rev. Jonathan Glyde, *Bradford*

Rev. J. H. Cooke, *Gomersal*
 Rev. Edward Leighton, *Ovenden*.

The Chairman observed, that they could not better commence the important and interesting business of the day, than by singing the 67th Psalm, "Shine, mighty God, on Britain shine," &c. This was followed by the reading of the 133d and 134th Psalms.

The Chairman then opened the immediate business of the meeting: I apprehend, beloved and honoured brethren, that it would be altogether a waste of time, which you will feel with me to be on this occasion most precious, to enter into any thing like a long detail as to the purpose for which we are now assembled, and the circumstances under which we have met together. We are, as you all know, an adjourned meeting from the annual assembly of the Congregational Union of England and Wales, held in London in the month of May last, a meeting adjourned to this place as a central town, easy of access from all parts of the empire—and, brethren, we gratefully acknowledge and feel the kindness, and hospitality, and cordiality with which our friends have welcomed us. It is adjourned to this place for a specific purpose, as far, as I am aware, for one purpose only, and that a purpose so important, that we deemed it altogether impossible to give it any thing like the serious consideration which it demands and deserves, at a single annual meeting, when other matters pressed upon us, and, of necessity, engrossed much of our time. We, therefore, determined, and now, through the good providence of God, we are enabled to carry that determination into effect, to hold a meeting for that special purpose here in Birmingham, and now we are convened to compare our opinions, and to consult together with regard to this great object. The purpose of our assembly, then, is to consider whether, as a Union, we shall give attention now to home missionary operations; (hear hear) give attention to them under the immediate direction, and upon the principles on which our Union is established; (hear) whether we shall do this at all, brethren; and then, having ascertained that question, which I hope we shall settle in the affirmative, (cheers) which will be for you to determine. (Renewed cheers.) I rejoice, brethren, in that response, for it argues well as to the issue of our proceedings; then, I say, having settled that question, we shall have to determine how we are to carry the principle out into its practical details. I trust that our brethren here, every minister, and every layman, is come fully prepared to state all his mind; (hear hear) his whole mind, that we may have every difficulty, every objection, every

particular view which gentlemen may entertain upon the subject, fully before us, that we may perfectly understand what we have to do, the elements by which we are surrounded, the difficulties against which we may have to struggle, in order that we may, by the blessing of God, if he shall so far favour us with his holy guidance and direction, devise judicious plans adapted to the necessities of the case, and which shall be owned and honoured by him in the accomplishment of the great end which we have in view; for whatever different opinions may be entertained by us as to details, we are perfectly assured that only one desire pervades every heart: (hear hear) a desire to promote the best interests of our countrymen who are perishing in indolence and sin, and in advancing their interests, at the same time to promote the glory of our God. (Cheers.) Having said thus much, I presume the meeting will be of opinion that I have said enough; (laughter) therefore I shall call upon our Secretary to tell us what is in his heart, and what is in his hand, (referring to the printed resolutions,) and to state to us, as no doubt he is prepared to do, what are the topics on which we are to deliberate, and by our deliberations, on which we shall be brought, I trust, to a happy and unanimous result. (Cheers.)

The Rev. ALGERNON WELLS said he had no right to occupy the time of the meeting otherwise than as he might be the organ expressing the judgment of the Committee in London; but feeling confident that he should have their concurrence in what he was about to say, he would venture for a few moments to trespass on their attention. In the first place, then, said the Rev. Gentleman, I believe it is understood that this is properly a deliberative assembly, (Hear.) We bring nothing here to be passed as a matter of course, (hear) we present nothing upon the supposition that they are sentiments and resolutions which will find immediate concurrence; but whatever we submit, we submit that it may be discussed. In point of fact, we bring before you the plan of a Home Missionary Society in connection with our Union—rather as a basis to guide the discussion, than as a document which we suppose will receive general and immediate concurrence; and therefore I must reiterate what our Chairman has so well expressed, namely, our earnest hope that every opinion will be expressed and every difficulty stated. (Hear.) We are anxious to know what we should do—we are desirous of ascertaining what will meet the concurrence and approbation of our brethren; for, as between two plans, in other respects equally advantageous, that must be far the best which gains the largest amount of concurrence, and I would even say, that a plan though less eligible in itself, would be preferable to one more eligible, if the less eligible should happen to have the largest amount of concurrence. (Hear, hear.) This document which I hold in my hand will be distributed through the room. If it be enquired why this distribution has not taken place earlier, I reply that the Committee in London did not know where to draw the line; they thought on the one hand, that by sending it to every brother throughout the country, they would be incurring an unjustifiable expense; and, on the other, that if they made selections and sent it to some and not to others, there would be a risk of incurring the charge of neglect, (hear)—besides which, it was not sufficiently prepared until near the time of meeting, to be of much service, even if all could have possessed it. I do not know that you will expect me to add much more than what is simply explanatory; and this with the permission of the chair—of the course proposed to be pursued in the conduct of the meeting. I believe we shall be favoured by the Chairman reading to us this plan, not including the address which is appended. After this, it will be moved and seconded that this plan be received, the intention of which motion will be to raise the question of principle, just as in the Legislature a bill is read that the principle may be discussed, and then upon the issue of that discussion, the matter is taken up *seriatim*, clause by clause; that is, if it shall be carried in the affirmative, “That this plan be received,” the intention then is afterwards to take up each clause *seriatim*, and discuss it separately. The first question raised,

then, will be one of principle, and that question of principle will resolve itself, I believe, into several branches. The first branch will be, probably, "Will you undertake home missions denominationally?" I apprehend there will not be a oneness of opinion upon that subject. (Hear, hear.) This document sets forth a plan for home missions denominationally. (Hear.) That is one, therefore, of the principles which will come under discussion upon the motion, That the plan be received. Another question for discussion will be, "Will you build your plan upon the constitution of your churches?" This plan attempts to build upon church constitution and organization; but if you affirm that you will undertake home missions denominationally, it does not at all follow that you should take them upon your church constitution, because it is quite open for you to form a society upon a popular basis, similar to the Colonial Society; and yet that it should be denominational, the government of the Society being formed upon a money qualification, as in societies generally. Here, then, is another principle which will receive discussion upon the question, "That this plan be received." There is still a third, which might blend the two. We might have church organization, and, in connection with it, a money qualification also. I think when this plan is read, these views will unfold themselves to the minds of the brethren; and they are the great points for discussion. I flatter myself that there are, indeed, some points in the plan, relating to the actual operation of the Society, which will commend themselves at once to the judgment of all. But the great thing to be discussed is, "What shall we do as a denomination of Christians, as relative to our own specific opinions and distinctions, standing before the world as a separate body of Christians. I should have forbore to say any thing with regard to existing societies for the spread of the gospel in our country, but for an intimation from an honoured brother in whose judgment I repose confidence. Now, for myself, I can say that nothing is farther removed from my thoughts than a feeling of hostility or of disrespect to any body in existence, (hear, hear, hear) and I trust that, in no printed or written document issued by the Union, has there been anything like a disrespectful expression to any existing Society, (hear, hear) or any kind of imputation upon their motives, or any thing reflecting upon honoured brethren who are pursuing a course which doubtless commends itself to their own judgment and conscience as best for their country and the church. (Hear.) But, having said so much, may I ask, supposing that in the course of this discussion that question should also come before us, Must we indeed have two organizations? Is it not possible that one should answer all the purposes? I do hope, brethren, that that question will receive at your hands the fullest discussion, (hear); and, for myself, while I am anxious, I own, that we should act denominationally, I am so much more solicitous for the object than the mode of accomplishing it, that if this assembly said, "No, we will not work denominationally; we will work upon the catholic plan," I shall be content to go by the judgment of the majority, and the general feeling of our body. (Hear, hear.) If they like the open plan best, there will be nothing left for us then but to unite with one heart and one mind. (Hear, hear.) If, unhappily, we cannot agree, we must bear with one another. If our brethren like the catholic plan, they must allow us to follow the denominational plan, as we that like the denominational plan must allow them to follow the catholic plan, not casting reflections upon each other, but pursuing a common object as we think best for the glory of God and for the good of our country. (Hear, hear.) I do not wish to obtrude a single remark more than is necessary upon this assembly. I am here acting for you, my brethren, in the best way in my power, filling a situation of no little anxiety, in which your confidence has placed me; and nothing is to me, in that position, of more importance than to know what the sentiments of my brethren are, and I will endeavour, in the best way in my power, to carry into effect what your general sentiments shall approve. (Cheers.)

The Chairman then read a letter from the Rev. Dr. Payne, of Exeter, addressed "To the Assembly of the Congregational Union," stating, at great length, the writer's views with regard to home missions.

After a brief conversation upon a question of form, in which the Rev. T. East and the Secretary took part,

The Chairman proceeded to read the draught of the plan presented by the Committee in London. Several official documents were then presented from the Association of the North Riding of York, from the Northamptonshire Association, giving in their adherence to the Union, which was received with loud cheers. The Rev. J. A. James, of Birmingham, and the Rev. George Smith, of Plymouth, also made communications from Cornwall and South Devon.

The Chairman having inquired if there were any other communications of a similar kind to be presented,

The Rev. RICHARD ELLIOTT, of Devizes, wished to state why he was present at that meeting, and in what character. "I appear," continued the reverend gentleman, "as a delegate from the Wilts and East Somersetshire Association; but I come here to hear, to see, and to report progress. (Hear hear.) I have no power to pledge, my brethren, to any particular object, but I have an independent right to pledge myself (hear); and, therefore, whatever part I may take at this meeting, I wish it to be understood distinctly that I can only pledge myself, and not my brethren. (Hear.) Let it be understood, that in my own person, I am friendly to the object."

The Rev. Messrs. D. Aston, Roberts, and Cook, having also explained in what capacity they appeared in the Assembly, the Chairman called upon the meeting to proceed with the special business of the day.

The Rev. Dr. REDFORD, of Worcester, in proposing the first resolution, spoke to the following effect: "Mr. President, and beloved brethren, although I feel that on this occasion we should all abstain as much as possible from introducing any thing that is not directly tending to the business before us, yet it is impossible for me to rise in your presence without being deeply impressed with feelings of delight and joy that we are arrived at this day. This is what many of us have been looking forward to from the first field-day, when we gathered amicably to contest whether we should unite at all or not. (Hear.) We were reminded last night of more than one failure in the formation of a Union among our churches prior to the establishment of this; but, at the formation of this Union, we so fully explained to one another what our objects and aims were, that a most perfect understanding was obtained among those who did meet, and it was only our regret that all could not meet on those interesting occasions, when we examined, and explored to the very foundation, as I conceive, the fundamental principles on which our Union is established. And yet, from year to year, we have been met with the questions, 'What can you do? what are you doing? and what is the use of your Congregational Union?' Those questions always appeared to me a little captious, because they were like asking, 'What can the young colt do?'—'Let him grow, give him time; he will make a war-horse, or a race-horse, or, at least, a useful horse, if you will but let him grow.' Well, though our brethren were a little captious, yet I acknowledge many of them came into the plan of our Union year after year, who were enabled to see that we can do good, that we have done much good, (hear) and I hope that all now see, even in those counties that have been most of all obscured in the exercise of this vision, that, at least, we shall do no harm. (Hear.) We have discarded legislation from the first. (Hear.) When we assembled to discuss the principle at the first meeting, those who were, if I might so speak, the originators of the idea, acknowledged as ardently and firmly as any of our brethren could desire, that they never meant, that they never would lend themselves to the forming any laws for the government or controul of any of our churches. (Hear.) I believe, up to this hour, they have acted upon that principle. There has been nothing in the deliberations, in the discussions, or in the business

pursued by the Institution in which I could, for I am as jealous of liberty as any man not in the Union, nothing in which I could see the least ground of complaint, as it regards the liberties of the churches. (Hear.) Now let us congratulate one another that we are come to this day. Something, indeed, has already been accomplished, over which we may well rejoice, in the formation of the Colonial Mission. If the Congregational Union had done, and could do nothing more for the next twenty years, than it has done in reference to that important Institution, it has still done enough to commend it to the affections and the confidence of all the churches. (Cheers.) But now we are called to do more, and to do the very thing which I confess I have been looking forward to from the formation of the Union. But we were not in that consolidated state necessary to secure an extensive co-operation, through the length and breadth of the land, until this day; and now that we are met, it is my great happiness to say, that we are in circumstances more favourable for forming a general combination for the spread of the gospel than we have ever been before. We have new and most important accessions here to-day, (hear) accessions of beloved brethren whom we all cordially respect and esteem. It is delightful to see that the principle of love is circulating among us, and binding our hearts together. There is no denomination in Great Britain which could present, at this instant, a finer specimen of brotherly love, or more complete identity of principle on all the great subjects of faith, discipline, and order, than our body does here to-day. (Cheers.) We all know that we can travel from one end of the kingdom to the other, and can meet our brethren with the greatest cordiality, and repose in them the greatest confidence. (Hear, hear.) We know that they preach the same gospel, and that their hearts are devoted to the same great objects. We consider it to be no slight honour to our denomination, that we have not a single minister or a single church which is supporting the cause of heresy. (Cheers.) Can this be said of the Established Church, with all its glory? Are not the holy men of God in that church at this day clothing themselves with sackcloth, putting on ashes for the degradation and defilement of their Zion, and the peril in which she is placed by those abominable heresies which are spreading to such an alarming extent amongst her people? I feel that I have already said too much on this subject; but, Sir, you and this meeting will bear with me, standing up as I do before you to-day, one of the first originators of the Union, in conjunction with my dear brother, Mr. Blackburn, and some others who are not present, who had to make our way amid many difficulties, and had to labour hard to convince our staunch dissenting brethren that they really could unite together. (Hear.) We saw in the gospel of Christ the germ and spirit of that union, and were persuaded that the catholic fellowship and love which prevailed among us, would one day guide and constrain us, as by the love of Christ, to unite ourselves into one body. (Cheers.) I feel delighted to-day, because our warmest expectations are far exceeded by this meeting. (Hear.) When I heard that at the May meeting—for I was not able to attend it, through a very grievous affliction—it was determined to hold an adjourned meeting here, I really feared that the project for a home mission would fall to the ground, supposing that it would be impossible to obtain such an attendance as would give to it the required impetus at the outset. But most delighted I am to meet such a company of my brethren. The principle by which we are actuated is found to be as strong to draw us to Birmingham, as it is to draw us to London. (Hear.) We have nearly as large an assembly here to-day, certainly of country brethren, as we usually have in London, and I shall not fear, from this hour, either for our Union or for the home missionary cause. (Hear.) It is a day which gladdens my heart, and I have no doubt, Sir, it gladdens yours; and our brethren residing in this town must feel that this day will be signalized in the future history of our churches (loud cheers), for this day I hope the Lord our God will give us a spirit of oneness and *helpfulness* that we may exercise this spirit so as to help one another. (Hear.) Now with regard to the plan which you have heard, I move that it be now received as the basis of

discussion, not adopted at once. What has been already said is true of most of us who belong to county associations, and is perfectly understood by the Secretaries and the Committee of the Union, who do not expect us to pledge our associations. We meet for the most frank discussion, without pledging our associates. As to the plan, I certainly approve of it in the main, though I think it susceptible of some alterations for the better, which in the course of the discussion to-day and to-morrow, will I doubt not be made. I approve of the principle as stated by the Secretary. He left it for us to consider whether it should be a *denominational*, or whether it should be what he called a *catholic* principle. Now, I really could not see myself a distinction! (Cheers.) My denomination is the catholic denomination. (Hear.) I am a Congregationalist because congregationalism is the catholic principle, because we can admit Christians of all denominations to our communion. (Cheers.) I, as a Congregationalist, discard all human legislation, set aside, as of any authority in the church, in its government, the opinions, or decisions of men, lay, ecclesiastical, political, and what not. (Hear, hear.) Well, then, I say I am as catholic as any man. No man ought to wish me to be more catholic than my Bible, that contains the universal gospel, reveals the universal Saviour, and the universal plan for the salvation of the world, and that is the plan which I adopt as a Congregationalist. I enforce nothing of what I consider to be the proper management of church affairs upon any person who wishes to join our fellowship. If a man is a believer in Jesus Christ our Lord, but he says, "I think the Presbyterian system is right," I reply, "Very well, Sir, you are not required to pledge yourself to *Independency*—come into the church." If a man says, "I should like to join the church, but I think the episcopalians are right in their system," I answer, "Very well, Sir, I don't wish you to subscribe to *Independency*; you can come and unite with us, at the table of the Lord; we are upon the catholic principle—not the Roman principle, but the principle of Jesus Christ—'He that believeth shall be saved.'" (Cheers.) Now I think our plan is the catholic plan; still I admit that the word has another conventional sense in which it was used by our esteemed Secretary. It is meant by him to refer to an existing institution, which seems, to include all plans, because it admits all parties into it, all of whom are allowed to a mutual influence, and does not pretend to set up churches, but simply to preach the gospel. But I must say, that is only a part of the New Testament plan for the promotion of the gospel; it does not carry out the plan of the apostles, which is to found churches wherever churches may be needed. It is thus confined and restricted in its operations, and though called the catholic plan, it is not quite catholic enough for me. (Cheers.) Under these circumstances, I do certainly approve of the denominational plan now laid before us; and move, therefore, that it be received for the purpose of being carefully examined and cautiously discussed in all its parts. If we come to our argument upon this document, we must then introduce it to our associations, and obtain the opinion and concurrence of our brethren upon it. Several associations will meet in the course of a few weeks, at their autumnal meetings, when an opportunity will be afforded of discussing what may be agreed upon at this meeting. Then I think we shall be in a state by May next, to report to the special meeting of the Union, what are the opinions and feelings of the associations as to the general plan. I beg leave now to move, "That the plan be received for the purpose of discussion."

The Rev. THOMAS WEAVER, of Shrewsbury, in seconding the resolution, said, that he believed that the plan was adapted greatly to promote the glory of the Redeemer in the advancement of the immortal interests of perishing men in all parts of the country.

A long and somewhat desultory conversation now arose upon some points of form, which was terminated by the unanimous adoption of the motion.

The Rev. Dr. FLETCHER, of Stepney, then said, I conceive, Mr. Chairman, and christian brethren, that all which can be necessary has, in fact, been said by my esteemed brother, who moved the reception of the whole document, and

who has brought the present matter under discussion. In what he said, Sir, in relation to the importance, the desirableness, and the necessity of the general union of our churches, for British home missionary efforts, I most cordially concur. I feel, however, that there are no small practical difficulties involved in the whole question, especially such as arise out of some existing institutions. But if we come to this enquiry in the spirit of love, if we are determined to make all personal concessions, and to come in to all the necessities of practical adjustment which may be adopted, no real difficulty will be found; and it occurs to me, that if there should be, for a time, a difficulty in determining whether our home missionary efforts should be denominational, I think my friends who support what is termed the Catholic principle, will feel it to be their duty and their privilege to combine with the great majority of the brethren and churches, should they cordially adopt the denominational principle. (Hear.) I would not, for a moment, wish to depreciate the operations or the successes of the Home Missionary Society. For a certain time I was nominally, certainly not effectively connected with it, and rendered very feeble service to it. But I have the conviction very deeply, and even painfully fixed in my own mind, that that Society has not penetrated sufficiently into the destitute parts of our country; that amongst our churches and associations generally, it has not that measure of sanction, and support, and co-operation which, years ago, I thought it entitled to, and which, were there not, at this moment, the project of another form of home missionary operations, I should say it is still entitled to. But, looking at matters as they now stand, and contemplating the present position of our body, the enemies of our system, I use the term advisedly, who employ all the means in their power to subvert and oppose every thing which characterizes our principles, our discipline, and our polity. I think we are come to a point when, if Congregational principles are worth maintaining and defending, they must be maintained and defended. (Applause.) We should not be faithful to our own convictions if, in our general notions of Congregationalism, and views of church government, we were really forgetting what we ought to maintain and hold as the great fundamental principle of church government and order; and, next in importance to the priesthood of Christ, I mean our views of the regal office. We are not to forget the sceptre of our Lawgiver and King any more than his cross; and we should be disloyal to him as our Head and Lord, if we were not, especially at this period, determined unitedly to maintain what we deem the great characteristic principles of his churches. (Cheers.) And I believe, Sir, in proportion to the degree in which we keep even that subordinate question before us, we shall be best prepared to effect even the object of Catholic union and combination. The value of union with those who differ from us, consists in the importance we attach even to the points on which we differ. If there were no difference, there would be no value in candour, no value in combination; but when maintaining our great and fundamental principles, we still look beyond them to greater objects, such as to missions abroad, or the circulation of the Bible to all, I maintain that we are then best prepared for concentrating and strengthening our forces at home. The more we can make the centre strong, the more shall we be prepared for vigorous efforts to the whole extent of our sphere. (Cheers.) While we hold what belongs to the centre lightly and loosely, and have no very firm notions on the point, we shall not, as a body, effect what we should otherwise effect; I value any attempt to diffuse the knowledge of Christ at home, but I am quite sure that our churches have never yet risen justly and properly to the dignity, or the sanctity, or the efficiency of their own principles. (Hear, hear.) We have not been sufficiently concerned in this matter; we have been doing everybody's work but our own; the common fags of the whole christian workshop. We have worked for schools, missions, and Bible societies, and for every other good or general object, (hear, hear, hear,) but, Sir, we have not, in my own judgment, taken care of ourselves, and we shall be far better prepared even to take care of others if

we can more effectually serve ourselves. (Cheers.) Now, Sir, the Congregational Union, convened on this occasion, appears to me to be one of the most important Societies existing in our kingdom; and, as our brother, Dr. Redford, said, if it had done nothing but originate the Colonial Missionary Society, it deserves the confidence, and esteem, and love, and prayers of all our churches. You and I, Mr. Chairman, have worked together, in days that are past, in the County of Lancaster, and I am reminded, by the proceedings of this very day, of one of your annual meetings—I would call them the most effective county meetings in the kingdom. At your last annual meeting in Lancaster, £2000 was voted, an amount which called indeed for thankfulness, and afforded great encouragement. (Cheers.) I hope I shall see the Lancashire County Union, and the Hants County Association, and all the Associations in the kingdom with us in this movement. (Hear.) I cannot see one reason, affecting this general union, that does not directly affect every one of our associations. The Rev. Doctor went on to speak at length of the efforts which had been made to promote union in Lancashire—efforts in which those venerable men, Roby and Charrier, took part, and of the beneficial results which had followed. “In that union,” said the Rev. Gentleman, “I believe there were at first only thirty-five churches, but now there are not less than ninety, (cheers), a very large portion of which had arisen, directly or indirectly, out of the operations of the County Union. At the commencement of many of these churches, only ten or twenty persons were gathered together. A room was obtained, and the town crier was sent round to announce that there would be preaching in the Market-place or Town Hall. At length churches were formed; those churches now support themselves, have all the machinery of christian instruction around them, and are effectively supporting that very institution from which themselves have arisen. (Hear, hear.)

The Chairman,—One of those churches, in two hours, raised £1440 for our new Lancashire College. (Cheers.)

The Rev. Dr. FLETCHER resumed:—I am sure, Sir, if all knew the real strength of our principles and their effective working, more would be done. But we are distrustful and suspicious, we are too jealous and not sufficiently mindful of the great and common objects of our own order; and I say advisedly *our order and denomination*, because I feel persuaded that the principles of that order are identified with the essential principles of our common Christianity, and because I believe that those principles will most conduce to the advancement of our common Christianity, and on no other ground, are we anxious to give strength and firmness, and concentration to our system. If the annual assembly were to circulate in the great towns of our empire a great and important good would be the result; or if an autumnal meeting were held in some part of the country, then all possible ground of jealousy about London, for we can't make it less than it is—do what we will we cannot alter its position any more than we can alter the central position of Birmingham—then, I say, there could be no further ground of jealousy, while I am quite sure we should be prepared to make simultaneous efforts for the spread of the gospel to an extent which has never yet been realized, and our brethren belonging to the old Society in Chatham Place might soon be induced to join us. (Cheers.) There are particular reasons why we should be denominational. When that Society began there was no Baptist Home Missionary Society, no Countess of Huntingdon's Home Missionary Society, and therefore on the ground of self-defence, I really think we shall far more effectually gain our object by making the mission a part of our system. The Congregational Union of Scotland is the Home Missionary Society of our denomination in Scotland, and could the Home Missionary object, be detached from it, it might in some quarters be received with more confidence, but in point of fact it would be weakened by the separation. (Hear.) The truth should be known. The Home Missionary Society is professedly catholic and denominational, if you choose to call it so, and yet in point of fact, it is denominational, for it receives its support principally from our denomination.

XIII

I think honesty, Sir, is the best policy. (Hear.) Let, then, the strictly denominational character be maintained, avowed, and duly and faithfully worked. Sir, I may take the liberty when the details of the plan come under your notice to obtrude myself again on the attention of the meeting.

The Rev. JOHN KELLY, of Liverpool, briefly supported the plan.

The Rev. J. A. JAMES also rose to support it. After eulogizing the document, which he described as incomparably excellent, deserving the admiration of all who were attached to their principles, he proceeded thus:—Sir, the question now, I believe, before us is, whether the projected Society is to be denominational, or what has been described, with certainly much vagueness, Catholic. Now, Sir, taking the two terms in their conventional meaning, and which is perfectly obvious to us all, I shall assign several reasons, not to trespass at any great length, why it is decidedly proper that the Institution should be denominational. In the first place, I am a Congregationalist, I attach high value to my principles. (Hear.) I have taken them up, I hope, after some degree of examination. I have tried them for a period of four or five and thirty years. I am neither afraid of them, ashamed of them, nor weary of them; but grow in attachment to them as I grow older and approach nearer to the end of my course. I think Congregationalism is primitive Christianity, and much do I wish that that should be the designation with which we present ourselves before the public. Now, Sir, for my own part, I cannot conceive of a more effective manner to disparage the principles of Congregationalism before the world than to be for ever running away from them after this, what I must call, shadowy phantom of catholicity. (Hear.) It does strike me that we are taking pains to induce the public to think lightly of our principles, because we appear to think lightly of them ourselves. Sir, we can never expect to gain respect for any cause if we take it up with lukewarmness. There is a conviction of sincerity which of itself tends to produce conviction in others. Now, Sir, on that ground—from my attachment to the principles of Congregationalism, I am prepared to do all I can in a scriptural way to propagate them in the world. I am not a bigoted Congregationalist. I hope, Sir, I am an intelligent one, firm and unflinching to any principles. In the next place, these are not the times, brethren, when we should set lightly by the principles of Congregationalism. (Hear.) There is a widely-extended confederacy for their repression and suppression, and if we do not stand up boldly for their defence the end will probably be more easily accomplished than we now like to contemplate. Let us not for one moment in this day, I lament to say, of the strife of parties, appear timid, recreant, and afraid of the convictions which we have adopted, and the line of conduct which we have founded upon them. There never was a period since the passing of the Act of Toleration when it more, in my judgment, became the Congregational ministers and churches to confederate together for their own mutual and general support. (Cheers.) Sir, our principles are safe; they are where the principles of the Reformation were before the time of Luther—in the Bible; and therefore we have not any great cause to fear, I admit, confederate who may, that these principles will be extinguished. (Cheers.) But these are not the times when we must even seem to be indifferent as to our distinctive opinions. If ever they were valuable they are valuable now, (hear,) and we are called upon to rally around and defend them by all the intelligence and zeal which we can carry into the conflict. Besides, Mr. Chairman, I will contend that the most effectual means of obtaining support for home missionary operations is the project contained in the plan before us for placing them, as it were, in the hands of our churches. Those churches have never yet, in my judgment, been called out as they ought to have been called out, to their own appropriate and inherent duty, that of spreading themselves every where around through the length and breadth of the country. If you trust your mission to casual collections, you will

find it extremely difficult, in this age of many institutions—God be thanked that they are so many, and that the stagnancy of past ages has been disturbed—still, I say, you will find it difficult, and somewhat precarious, to base support for your new society upon the mere principle of Congregational collections. I admire, Sir, beyond what I am able to express, that feature in the plan that has been read, which makes the churches, so to speak, responsible for the support of this Institution. Gentlemen, I will just relate, in support of this view, the results of my experience in reference to a somewhat similar institution—more confined, I admit, but still homogeneous to that which you project. It has long appeared to me that the churches ought, from their very nature and design, to be the chief instruments in spreading the truth all around them. I suggested this to the members of my own church, and resolutions were drawn up binding them, as a church, to the support of a town mission. It was laid before them in a form that was likely, as far as any thing could be so, to take a hold on their conscience, their judgment, and their imagination. It did so. The members were told that it would be the custom (not the law) of the church, to subscribe towards the town mission. They came into it instantly with readiness; the matter was so simple, the duty so obvious, as to commend itself to the judgment of all. We now raise, (I merely mention the fact to show what may be done,) £200 a year in small subscriptions towards the support of our town mission. Church members feel that it belongs to them, that it is their business, their duty, and they are prepared to do it. Now, Sir, if we all could, in a similar manner, put this home mission upon the judgment and conscience of the churches, what might not be done? (Hear.) Let this, if it can be—and I think, with a little diligence and perseverance, it might be done—let this be the class penny of the Independent churches. (Hear.) How many members of our churches do nothing for our denomination, though they support every foreign object, and would be ready for a home object, if that were brought before them by their pastors. We have not, Sir, sufficient confidence yet in our principles and in our churches. (Hear.) There is a shrinking, Sir, from the subject of bringing collections before them. But let this be taken to the church meeting; let them be told that this is not the law, but this is the custom. “You are dissenters of the Congregational order, and you think your principles important, then give your penny a week towards the support of a mission, the design of which is not ultimately to spread your principles, but to make your principles the subordinate means of spreading the truths of the glorious gospel of the blessed God in the world.” Now, Sir, I prefer a denominational plan, again, because I think—perhaps I may be somewhat ignorant of details—the catholic, as it is called, has not been very abundant in raising means. What does the London Missionary Society get by its catholicity? What has the Home Missionary Society got by being catholic? Where are the resources to be found? Whence does the money come? Talk as long as you will, gentlemen, about catholicity, depend upon it the money comes, after all, from yourselves. (Hear.) You divide the honour, as regards the designation of the Society, with others, but you pay for the honour yourselves. (Hear.) And after all we say, as far as our observation extends, those whom you wish to conciliate care nothing for the catholic principle. They don’t want to be catholic. (Hear.) You must be aware that this is the case, and that, in fact, all the catholicity is on one side. Here is a fallacy, Sir, as I have already shown you, in this term catholic. In what are your operations catholic but in name? What are your agents? Dissenters. What kind of ordination do your evangelists receive? Congregational ordination. Every thing is denominational, gentlemen, already. Why, then, should we shrink from our own designation, when, in fact, we already act upon the principles of our denomination? Again, upon what principles do your associations act? Are these catholic? What your

county associations? No. Do you shrink from the denominational designation in them? I trow not. You never profess catholicity there. I believe you are strictly denominational. What is your Congregational Union? A union of unions. And, therefore, why be denominational in your county and in your smaller associations, and talk of catholicity in your larger one—the general Congregational Union. On these grounds, Mr. Chairman and christian friends, I am certainly and entirely for the establishment of a denominational home mission. I respect the brethren who differ from me in their views on this subject. I would not say a syllable to hurt the mind of any individual present who feels it his duty to be catholic—and in all proper catholicity I'll be one with him. (Hear.) I will not say any thing to excite a prejudice against the Home Missionary Society; I will simply say that it has not certainly received the general confidence of the churches; and, without at all going into a detail of their measures, without scrutinizing these, without at all applying a word of regret to any thing that has been done, or what has not been done, it appears to me to be enough to say that it has not secured the co-operation of the denomination to which its directors unquestionably belong. If this be the case, then it becomes us to enquire whether we should not set up an institution that will secure us—I hope we shall be able to set up one that will—the confidence of the churches generally. (Cheers.) With these views, Mr. Chairman, I do most cordially support the proposition which is now before us.

The Rev. JOHN ROBINSON, of London, then rose and said, Mr. Chairman, I may, perhaps, be allowed to explain the position in which I imagine that the Home Missionary Society at this moment stands. (Hear.) I should not like it to be understood that the Directors of that Society are uniformly attached to the catholic principle as the basis of a Home Missionary Society. (Hear, hear.) There is, Sir, considerable difference in the Board upon that point. But it is argued that they are necessarily catholic in consequence of their having had monies left them by persons who thought that principle the best for evangelizing this country. They have recently received a large legacy, which they imagine was bequeathed on that ground, and they feel themselves pinched by a point of law to a catholic principle, whilst, perhaps, in their judgment they might have been led to adopt another plan of operations. I wish the true state of the case to be before the meeting. (Hear.)

The Rev. JOHN SIBREE, of Coventry, said he had been looking over the plan of the Home Missionary Society, and he really could perceive nothing in that plan to prevent an alliance with the Union. (Hear.) He much regretted the way in which that matter had been treated by some of the friends of that Society. In a number of the Home Missionary Magazine there was the following paragraph, with regard to the education which they (the Congregationalists) proposed to give to their missionaries preparatory to their entering on the field of labour:—"Would it not tease and perplex the poor untutored villagers to speak to them of Mosheim or Milner, of Calvin or Arminius? They must hear of him who is the wisdom and the power of God; their spirits must be melted by the disclosures of redeeming love and mercy." This document, as if to give it greater prominence, had even appeared on the cover of the magazine. (Hear, hear.)

The CHAIRMAN:—Is it signed as official?

The Rev. J. SIBREE:—Yes; "Thomas Thompson, Treasurer; Benjamin Hanbury, Sub-Treasurer." In conclusion, he (Mr. Sibree) thought if there was any point of law it ought to be immediately brought before the Court, that it might be seen, from the plan, whether the Society would be betrayed by applying its funds to the promotion of the cause of Home Missions in connection with the Congregational Union. (Hear.)

BENJAMIN HANBURY, Esq., wished to explain the apparent inconsistency in his conduct with regard to the document which had been read by Mr.

Sibree. (Hear.) To make short a long story, it so happened that he was in the minority there, (hear,) but he hoped to be in the majority on this occasion. (Cheers.)

The Rev. GEORGE SMITH, of Plymouth, had been requested by his brethren, in South Devon, to express their opinions, to some extent at least, in reference to the proposed plan of Home Missions in connection with the Congregational Union. He would, first of all, endeavour to convey a little information with respect to that district and Cornwall. South Devon had been for a considerable time connected with the Home Missionary Society; it had four stations, supported in an equal proportion by contributions in South Devon and from the Home Missionary Society in London. All their agents were firm Congregational Dissenters. (Hear.) His brethren, therefore, felt, with regard to the proposed Society, that even if they fully approved of the plan, they ought not to connect themselves with it, or to pledge themselves to it, till they had first of all honourably terminated their connection with the Home Missionary Society—(hear, hear,)—and that they would not be in a position to terminate that connection until this new Society was fully and firmly formed. They therefore wished—and they felt that this wish had been anticipated by the Committee in London—that the plan should be discussed in detail, and put before the public in its revised form, that opportunity might be given at the next annual meeting to carry it into full effect. He (Mr. Smith) could not conceal from himself the fact, that when they had set up this new Society the Home Missionary Society would go down. (Hear.) For nine-tenths of its support, after all that might be said of catholicity, came from Congregational churches. (Hear.) If that support, then, were withdrawn, or turned into a new channel, it must come to an end; it must be altogether swamped, or else retained in being by a connection with the Congregational Union. (Hear.) He trusted the latter would be the result. On these grounds his brethren in South Devon had felt considerable difficulty as to the propriety of giving in their adhesion at the present moment, but they were most cordially attached to the Union. The Rev. Gentleman then went on to describe the peculiar position in which himself and his brethren were placed—a position in which they had to struggle with a vast amount of clerical and tory influence, such as those who lived in large manufacturing towns could not form the least conception; this had led them to unite, and at that time there was not, he believed, in South Devon, a single Independent church which was not warmly attached to the Congregational Union. (Hear.) Mr. James had spoken of the value of their principles. If those principles were worth any thing, they were worth maintaining; if they were worth maintaining, they were worth maintaining at some sacrifice; if they were worth maintaining at some sacrifice, they were worth maintaining at the greatest amount of sacrifice. (Cheers.) Hitherto they had had very little of the *esprit de corps* among them; they had surrendered that to the general cry of catholicity. He then alluded to the fact that the Home Missionary Society had not answered the expectations of its friends, or done all the good which its friends could desire; assigning causes for this—one of which was the want of confidence on the part of many learned and influential ministers of the Congregational order, who were not in the list of its directors, or who seldom attended its meetings. If that body persisted in their present course, he would recommend that, whilst the old Society interested itself chiefly about the villages, the new one should attend more especially to large and second-rate towns. This, indeed, was the principal point to which he wished to call the attention of the meeting, for no reference had been made to it hitherto. They had been doing a great deal in the villages; but what, he would ask, had been the result? Why, many a village station had been supported by the Home Missionary Society for fifteen or twenty years, and still appeared as if it was never likely to sup-

port itself; while, perhaps, they had passed over some large town, entirely, in their great catholicity, lest some party should be a little jealous of their movements. (Hear.) If the same amount of money had been expended in supporting an Independent church in connection with the Congregational Union, that church would by this time have been extending itself, and been doing in its sphere as much good as they are now doing in the villages. (Hear.) He then made some interesting statements with regard to the towns and churches in Devon and Cornwall. In the latter county there were several large towns springing up, containing, perhaps, a population of 7 or 8000 inhabitants, but where there was not at present a single Independent church. (Hear.) "The few churches," said he, in conclusion, "already established in Cornwall have quite enough to do to take care of themselves—to maintain their own standing. (Hear.) We want a society like this which is projected, Sir, that shall collect the wealth of Manchester, and Liverpool, and Birmingham, and circulate it through the empire. Such a society, we believe, will be the means, in the hand of God, of accomplishing a most important work. I look to it with great interest. (Hear.) I have travelled a great way in order that I might be present with you on this occasion; and though I already love my principles—most dearly, most cordially do I love them—I shall certainly love them with greater zeal and greater devotedness when I feel that the only remaining blot has been entirely wiped away by giving new scope for their propagation through the length and breadth of the land." (Cheers.)

The Rev. J. BLACKBURN, of London, one of the Secretaries to the Congregational Union, addressed the meeting as follows:—Mr. Chairman, holding, with my friends on either hand, an official station amongst you, it would not become me to obtrude myself upon the attention of the brethren, except, with reference to the questions which have been fairly mooted respecting the Home Missionary Society, I differed in judgment with my beloved friend and colleague about the arrangement which should be at least attempted with the Home Missionary Society. I did think it practicable to bring that Society into harmonious operation with our projected movement, and therefore I induced our Committee in London to appoint a deputation, of which I formed a part, to meet the directors of the Home Missionary Society, and to confer with them upon the possibility of an amicable adjustment of our common interests. Will you allow me, Sir, to go into the particulars of our interview with the Board. (Hear.) I stated to them, that in the constitution and plan of their Society they are not at all committed to the general or open principle. (Hear.) There is no "fundamental principle," brethren, existing here, as there is in another society, which pledges us to any thing and nothing. I argued that, while there is nothing in their laws directly in favour of the supposed generality of their constitution, there is something on the other side, for the fourth rule is, "That this Society, in the furtherance of its object, shall co-operate with county associations and extend assistance to zealous country ministers, whose labours are impeded by the want of pecuniary resources." I asked our friends what they conscientiously believed that the phrase county associations meant—whether they thought it was ever intended to refer to any other county associations than those in existence connected with the Congregational body. I then alluded, for the purpose of illustrating my position, to a scheme which was formed in London to establish a Metropolitan Congregational Union. That attempt was abortive: it was attempted before the general union was formed, and our churches were not ripe for it. Mr. Hanbury and Dr. Fletcher were the secretaries of that society; but from some cause or other it did not lay hold of the public mind, and to make a decent exit the Committee proposed to form an alliance with the Home Missionary Society. That society accepted the overture, and took a chapel which the Metropolitan Union had previously

opened, but could not sustain; and thus this unsectarian society took under its patronage a Congregational church which we had planted, and also received the venerable friends I have named as officers of this catholic institution. And this explains the extraordinary position in which my friend Mr. Hanbury stands in their official staff. Thomas Thompson, Esq. is the treasurer, and Benjamin Hanbury, Esq. the deputy treasurer. Sir, it was literally an ecclesiastical job. (A laugh.) That place was made for my friend the historian of independency as much as ever a place was made under Government for some favorite adherent. (Laughter.) I did not wish, Sir, thus to occupy the time of my brethren, or to make them laugh; my object was simply to explain, that by the course I have described, the directors admitted long ago the principle for which I contended. (Hear.) And I therefore mentioned, that in point of fact, as there is no written law against their society's becoming denominational—so their usages—and particularly the fact that most of their missionaries are Independent Dissenters—that their usages are all in favour of the course I advocated. We then retired. I understood there was a sharp debate and a very close division, but the resolution declining our overture was carried by a very feeble majority. We only proposed that it should be called “the Home Missionary Society in connection with the Union of England and Wales,” and stand in the same relation to this Union that the Colonial Missionary Society occupies. Although they had declined our offer, we felt it would be only courteous and proper that we should invite them to attend this meeting, this was done which they also refused.

The Rev. ALGERNON WELLS here observed, that the last annual meeting of the Union had adopted a resolution to that effect.

The Rev. J. Blackburn proceeded:—My friend is correct. But I wish our brethren to understand that there really was an anxiety on our part to keep open our negotiations: that we went in the spirit of kindness to induce them to join with us, but they declined. I must say I think that course would have been the best. (Hear.) Something ought to be done with that society. One hundred thousand pounds have been already spent by it, and I would wish any of its warm-hearted friends to point out a single church which consists of a large and prosperous community as the fruit of its labour, the result of that great outlay. I shall be happy to be told that there are large interests which have been raised by the expenditure of £100,000. (Hear.) And if they have not succeeded in planting any numerous and important churches by that great expense, is it not obvious that our friends, however well-intentioned, have been on the wrong tack? (Cheers.) If we look, Sir, into the apostolic records, we find that the first preachers of the gospel planted churches in large towns, and that these churches sent out an emanating hallowed influence to all the districts round; and I am persuaded, brethren, that if we are permitted by our God to plant large churches in the great towns of our own kingdom—churches which shall embody the spirit and carry out the plans of those prize essays which have been just published by our Union, one of which, “Jethro,” I have read, and consider to be an extraordinary boon to our pastors and people—if churches are set up in towns of that order, the villages around them will, ere long, be blessed with schools and evangelists, and a happy change will soon take place in our denomination and the state of the country at large. (Cheers.)

B. HANBURY, Esq. in further explanation of his own position, begged to state that he was not present at the passing of the resolution referred to by Mr. Blackburn. He would say, also, that the offensive word had escaped the Committee: it was not intended to be so.

The Rev. JOHN SIRREE wished to say a word in answer to a question put by Mr. Blackburn, whether there was a prosperous church as the result of the operations of the Home Missionary Society? He (Mr. Sirree, was personally acquainted with a church, consisting of forty-five members, and two other churches, also very flourishing, and embracing, indeed, all the distinctive

principles of Congregationalism. (Hear.) He thought they were bound to pay all due respect to the Home Missionary Society. (Hear.)

R. O. WILLS, Esq. of Bristol, entered into a lengthened statement of home missionary operations in Cornwall, and the necessity which there existed for increased activity in that part of the country.

The Rev. Dr. MATHESON, of Wolverhampton, next addressed the meeting. He commenced by expressing the deep responsibility which he felt to rest upon himself, in common with his brethren, in reference to home missionary operations, which were so intimately connected with the happiness of the country and the glory of God. Perhaps, Sir, (continued he) I may also be allowed, for a few moments, to express what I believe to be the sentiments and feelings of my brethren connected with the Staffordshire Association of Congregational ministers and churches, which, though delegated to the last meeting, I had not at that time an opportunity of doing. It is, then, their opinion, that we must take a higher and bolder stand in the march of christian improvement than we have yet done. The conviction is deepened by recent circumstances, that, unless we are true to ourselves and to our principles, we shall not only fail to make progress through the breadth and length of the land, but shall be in danger of making a retrograde movement, and, as we believe that our principles are scriptural, and that they may become instrumental in diffusing the gospel more widely in our towns and villages than they have yet done, the very thought of their retrograding must be distressing to our minds. (Hear.) It is to me one of the highest gratifications I ever experienced to meet so many to-day for an object like this. (Hear.) I do not regret that we have not met sooner; I think a variety of circumstances continued to prevent that decided and extended union which we are now anxious, if possible, to obtain. Our brother, Dr. Redford, has referred to the early struggles of the friends of christian unity and love. Now it has appeared to me, Sir, that if we had prematurely brought forward a subject like this before the churches and associations of every county had become acquainted not only with the principles, but with the workings of the Congregational Union, we should have been defeated in our object, and we should not have been able to have commenced this great work in such a way as to have produced the results which we all desire. The Union has been formed; its principles are now known; the character of those who manage its affairs has been fully ascertained, and there is but one opinion amongst us to-day—that they have acted in such a manner as to secure the confidence of all the churches united with that Society. And we find that the adherence is being made by others to that Union. Providence seems to be working with us; the great Head of the Church appears to be working with us in this matter. With regard to the existing Home Missionary Society, I am ready to admit that it has been useful in places where weak associations could not have planted the gospel, and where, but for the instrumentality of that Society, hundreds and thousands would never have heard of salvation through Christ. I admit, that churches have been formed through the instrumentality of the Home Missionary Society, without being at all prepared to answer the question, to the full extent, which has been asked by Mr. Blackburn. (Hear.) The system of conciliation towards the Established Church has been tried by that Society, and we have had some experience of its working. If, Sir, we had generous enemies to deal with, who were ready cordially to give us the right hand of fellowship, because they love the truths we preach, instead of endeavouring to remove our evangelical missionaries from stations where they had been planted, and if these persons gave us credit for a right spirit, at least for a spirit of love, then we might almost have been prepared to continue to make a sacrifice of our peculiarities, in order, as far as we are concerned, to show to the churches and to the world that we do value the gospel more than our peculiarities. (Hear.) But, Sir, I know, as I have hinted, the workings of this plan of conciliation; it has entirely and palpably failed. (Hear.) Instead of doing good; instead of bringing to our

help those who belong to the episcopal church, it has had quite an opposite effect; they have taken every opportunity of taunting us with being snakes in the grass, and with other beautiful expressions. Such are not the individuals that we should strive to conciliate. Sir, let me mention, that I know a case where the introduction of an evangelical clergyman, whose stay was perfectly uncertain, has been made an occasion of withdrawing the agent of the Society sent by the desire and at the earnest entreaty of the County Association. (Hear.) Now, Sir, this is succumbing, this is being traitors to ourselves, this is injuring the great cause of our Lord and Master. (Cheers.) No denomination of Christians can be more Catholic than ourselves, or more ready to hold out the right hand of fellowship to others; but, Sir, we cannot, if we are true to ourselves, suffer our missionaries to be withdrawn, in order to conciliate those who are enemies to our polity. (Hear.) We are driven by the very movements of the day to establish and support a mission of our own. (Hear.) We know well enough that there is a conspiracy against us; we know that laity and clergy are combining their efforts to crush all the voluntary churches of Christ; and, therefore, unless we help ourselves, by a concentration of effort among us, not to spread sectarianism, but to spread the pure principles of the gospel, unless we are thus combined in our efforts, our smaller churches, those in country districts, will assuredly be destroyed. There is a combination on the part of our enemies to crush what is liberal in religious as well as in political matters; these persons are quick-sighted, and they know, that if they could extinguish the light of liberty which our churches diffuse throughout the land, the country will be their own. In some counties there are no associations of our churches at all, and there are many of our smaller churches which at this moment, have to struggle with difficulties that threaten their existence. There is a spirit of zeal and energy in the church party, which may well put us to shame. It seems to be their present policy to bring out the laity: and they engage in the struggle as for life and death. Were it a question of mere Sectarianism, I would not fight for it for a moment; were we discussing mere points of church government, much as I value these, yet, for their own sakes, I should care nothing about them; but I have a deep and daily increasing conviction that our principles are connected with all that can dignify in this life, or prepare for a higher state of being. I am convinced, that unless our denomination takes the position which it ought to do, we shall not merely injure ourselves, but shall be instrumental in abridging the civil and religious liberties of our country. (Hear.) I am afraid, Mr. Chairman, I have said too much; but I could not be silent on such a subject. I believe I have stated in these remarks, not only my own feelings, but those, also, of my brethren in the County of Stafford. They will correct me if I am wrong; but at the last annual meeting, when our respected Secretary was present, a resolution was passed, not pledging ourselves to details, but expressive of our conviction that more should be done for home missions in connection with the Congregational Union.

The Rev. GEORGE EVANS, of London, then delivered an address, which was in substance, an attempt to defend the Home Missionary Society from the reflections which he considered to have been cast upon it by several of the preceding speakers.

The Rev. J. EDWARDS, of Brighton, in allusion to the home association, stated that at the last annual meeting, the object of home missions came under consideration, and they only wanted a plan, such an one as that which had been laid before the meeting, to accede to it at once. (Hear, hear.)

The Rev. THOMAS BINNEY after addressing the meeting at considerable length, proceeded to read a letter which he stated he had received from some members of his congregation, and which mooted several points of ecclesiastical polity and practice. Dr. Redford spoke to order, and Mr. Binney withdrew the paper, but a long discussion respecting it ensued, which not being relevant to the business, we have not reported.

The Rev. ALGERNON WELLS then stated to the meeting his views with respect to the principle under discussion, and other topics which had been referred to in the course of the morning. In allusion to a remark made by Mr. Blackburn, he said he had always objected to their attempting to negotiate with the Home Missionary Society, and for the reason, that they ought to have a plan before the public for a new society, before they asked another society to join them. As to the agents employed by the old society, he (Mr. Wells) must say he thought it perfectly consistent to do all imaginable honour to those simple-minded missionaries, and yet to hold that there were ways of usefulness for which they were not competent, because they had not received a proper training. (Hear.) He was fully aware of the difficulties they would have to encounter in placing their own society upon a denominational footing. One of these difficulties would be that of making collections in localities where, though the brethren would be happy to assist them, they would find the way hedged up by other societies. (Hear.) They would also be exposed to immense obloquy. (Hear.) He was fully prepared to be told of the bigotry of this undertaking, and he feared that it would contribute to increase the pressure of hostility upon many of their brethren in their several stations, and especially where they were feeble and exposed to the influence of the property, aristocratical, and ecclesiastical powers of the country. He then went on to speak of the peculiar position of the Christian church generally at the present moment. "The providence of God," said the Rev. Gentleman, "may be dealing with various denominations of Christians in a way which it would not be very difficult to interpret. He may be looking down from the sublime place where he dwells, and saying to the episcopal church, 'There are, indeed, in you many things that I blame and condemn; nevertheless there is that in you which is precious enough to spare you in my hands;' and to us he may say, as he wrote by the apostle to the seven churches, 'You hate the doctrine of the Nicolaitaines, which I also hate; nevertheless, I have some things against you; you have my truth and my discipline, but remember you have not that high tone of spirituality which you are called upon to exhibit in accomplishing the things which I have prepared for you.' He has put us into the work, and let us look about and see what we are doing. He admonishes us that there are many crude notions, hostile to our peace, amongst many members of our churches. A missionary appointed and sent out by a denominational society would be met with hostility for this very reason, and therefore, if we mean to do any thing, it does appear to me that we must gird up our minds for united and difficult effort. (Hear.) It gives me the greatest satisfaction to find, that upon the whole this plan meets with your approval. There is not, indeed, an element in it which has not been already embodied in our associations. (Hear.) It is my firm opinion, that in proportion as it is pervaded by union, our church will be safe. (Cheers.) Six or ten neighbouring churches united together are a thousand times more likely to interfere with one another in their localities than 6000." (Hear.) The Rev. Gentleman concluded by an earnest appeal to all who heard him to maintain the principles of Congregationalism, which would always be found the best preservatives of civil and religious liberty.

The Rev. THOMAS SCALES, of Leeds, quite agreed with Mr. Wells in what he had just stated, they were called upon to guard the civil and religious liberties of the country from invasion. The question was not one affecting merely the merits or demerits of the Home Missionary Society, the question was, "Have the Congregational Churches of this country done what they ought to have done with a view to carry out their great principles?" (Hear.) He thought the plan proposed would enable them, at last to assume their proper position. (Hear hear.) There are many pastors and churches who though they had not avowed themselves were friendly to the Congregational Union. (Hear.) One great objection to that Union would be removed when it was seen to have an object worthy of itself, extending its healthful and peaceful influence through the country, and rendering aid where aid was most needed. As a body

they would become more united, than they had been hitherto, and their union would produce the best results upon the country and the world. He therefore felt great pleasure in acceding to the principle involved in the plan before the meeting and hoped it would meet with considerable support, even in quarters where now they did not expect it.

The Rev. JOSEPH GILBERT, of Nottingham, the Rev. John Kelly, of Liverpool, and the Rev. R. Fletcher, of Manchester, severally addressed the meeting in support of the principle.

The Chairman then said—It is with unspeakable pleasure that I rise to put the question. The motion before the meeting which was so ably moved and seconded by the Rev. Dr. Fletcher and the Rev. John Kelly, is this;—“*That in the judgment of this assembly it is an especial duty at the present time, of the Independent churches of this country to unite in vigorous home missionary efforts conducted in entire harmony with their distinctive views of the truth, ministry, and ordinances of the gospel, and of the constitution, discipline, and liberty of christian churches.*” Those who are of opinion that this resolution passes will signify the same by holding up their hands.

Every hand in the room seemed to be held up in favour of the resolution, accompanied with great enthusiasm.

The Chairman said—Christian brethren, may we not now unite and devoutly thank God for the happy and peaceful termination of this debate—for such it is in fact; the details will soon be got over now that we have settled this great principle—by singing that doxology so familiar to us all, and never more appropriate than at the present moment “Praise God from whom all blessings flow!”

The meeting then adjourned and proceeded to the spacious school-room of Ebenezer Chapel, Steel House Lane, where about 150 ministers and other gentlemen sat down to an excellent dinner, which did much credit to the hospitality and taste of the friends who had liberally provided it.

The Rev. Dr. Raffles presided, supported by the Secretaries, and surrounded by a most happy and united company.

After the Chairman had given eloquent expression to the sentiments of loyalty towards her Majesty the Queen, which is so warmly felt by Protestant dissenters, the company were addressed on several minor subjects by the Rev. Messrs. Wells, Gilbert, Ainslie, Blackburn, D. Ford, J. Edwards, Dr. Leifchild, and Mr. Josiah Conder.

The Rev. George Stephens, of Tottenham, Hants, was admitted as a member of the Union.

At seven o'clock the brethren attended public worship at Steel House Lane Chapel, when the Rev. Dr. Leifchild, of Craven Chapel, London, preached an interesting and impressive discourse to a crowded audience, from 1 Cor. i. 21.

We must defer until our next the report of the further proceedings of this deeply interesting meeting.

A MINERS' CHAPEL IN SHROPSHIRE.

On Friday, September 13th, interesting services were held in connexion with the opening of a new Independent chapel, at the Bog mines, Shropshire. These are situated at the top of a mountain, secluded from any other population except those employed in the works, with a few others, widely scattered through that barren region. This attempt to supply religious instruction originated with the miners themselves, who have contributed cheerfully from their weekly earnings, and occasionally given their labour during leisure hours. They have thus, with the assistance of the company of proprietors, erected a neat and commodious chapel; the opening of which excited considerable attention. Two sermons were preached on the occasion; in the morning by the Rev. Thomas Weaver, the venerable minister of Swan Hill Chapel, Shrewsbury; and in the afternoon, by the Rev. Samuel Luke, of Chester. Notwithstanding the unfavourable state of the weather, and the remoteness of the district, the attendance was good at both

services, in the afternoon to overflowing; and the collections amounted to £30. 1s. 4d. It was truly gratifying to see the miners, a race of men too generally distinguished by their ignorance and vice, attending with marked interest, and cheerfully contributing for the most part, silver on the occasion. It is proposed to settle a minister among them as soon as a suitable person can be obtained.

SALEM CHAPEL, WESTBROMWICH.

This place of worship was opened on Tuesday, Oct. 8th. The Rev. J. A. James, of Birmingham, preached in the morning; the Rev. J. Blackburn, of London, in the evening. On the following Lord's-day, the Rev. Mr. Cooper, formerly of Westbromwich, preached in the morning and afternoon, and the Rev. J. Dawson in the evening. The Rev. Messrs. Hudson and Galloway, of Westbromwich, Hammond, of Handsworth, and Hill, of Golnall, took part in the services. The collections were liberal. The chapel will accommodate, without galleries, between four and five hundred persons. Flourishing Sabbath and infant schools exist, in connexion with the chapel. The society originated in a friendly separation from the church which formerly met in the Old Meeting, but have recently assembled in Ebenezer Chapel. Thus two commodious Independent chapels have been opened at Westbromwich during the present year. Both the old and the new congregation exhibit a delightful interest in each other's prosperity. Altogether there are three Independent chapels in the parish, the population of which amount to 21,000 persons. Are there not other towns in the kingdom which, with equal, nay, with a larger population, still do not possess more than one chapel belonging to our denomination? Might not a portion of the church be dismissed with a view to originate another interest in another part of the town? Is not the example of the founders of Salem Chapel susceptible and worthy of imitation by other Christians?

NEW CHAPEL, ELTHAM, KENT.

On Tuesday, Oct. 22, a new Independent chapel was opened for divine worship in the beautiful village of Eltham, eight miles from London, on the Maidstone road. The Rev. Dr. Bennett preached in the morning; Mr. Chapman, of Greenwich, in the afternoon; and Mr. Blackburn, of Pentonville, in the evening. The devotional part of the service was sustained by the Rev. Messrs. Jeula, Cox, (Baptist) Verrall, Pulling, and James. The attendance was exceedingly good; in the evening overflowing. The chapel, which is built in the Saxon style, is an ornament to the village. We rejoice in the erection of this house of prayer in a village containing nearly 2500 inhabitants, very many of whom, it is feared, habitually neglect public worship. The parish church will contain but 700; and it is apprehended, the order of its ministry would not be acceptable to the readers of this periodical. The building has been erected by the instrumentality of the ministers and other friends resident in the Greenwich district of the Kent Association. The pastors of the neighbouring churches have engaged, for the present, to supply the pulpit in rotation. We heartily wish success to this infant cause, and regard it as an illustration of the advantages resulting from the union of the churches for the evangelization of their vicinity. The collections, including what was sent for the occasion, amounted to £39.

RE-OPENING OF AN INDEPENDENT CHAPEL, ANDOVER.

On Friday Evening, October 11th, after considerable enlargement, the Independent Chapel in East Street, Andover, was re-opened for public worship, when a discourse was delivered by the Rev. Thomas Adkins, of Southampton. On the following Sabbath, the morning and evening services were conducted by the Rev. J. Jefferson, from London, and the afternoon by Rev. J. S. Pearsall, Minister of the above chapel. Collections were made after each service towards the liquidation of the debt incurred by the improvement, which, with previous donations, amounted to £300. During the alteration of the building the con-

gregation assembled in the Town Hall, the use of which was readily granted by the Mayor.

RECOGNITION.

On Thursday, Oct. 24th, the Rev. George Taylor, formerly pastor of the Congregational Church, New Windsor, near Manchester, was publicly recognized as the minister of the Independent church assembling at Cheese Lane Chapel, Wellingborough, Northampton. The service was commenced by Mr. John Renals, minister of West End Chapel, in the same town, who read the scriptures and prayed. Mr. E. T. Prest, of Northampton, proposed the usual questions, which were satisfactorily answered. Mr. T. N. Toller, of Kettering, offered the designation prayer. Mr. T. East, of Birmingham, addressed the pastor; and Mr. Blackburn, of Pentonville, the people; and Mr. Davis, of Salem Chapel, in this town concluded.

In the evening, the members of the three Congregational churches in this town, united at West End Chapel, in the celebration of the Lord's Supper. Mr. Gray, Baptist minister, of Northampton, presided. Addresses were delivered by Messrs. Toller, Blackburn, and East. The chapel was crowded, and it was a season of great solemnity and holy enjoyment.

RESIGNATION AT HOMERTON COLLEGE.

The Rev. Daniel Godfrey Bishop has resigned his office of Classical Tutor at this College, in consequence of a change in his opinions in favour of Episcopacy. We understand that when his resignation was tendered to the Committee it was immediately accepted, and that his connexion with this institution has terminated in a manner creditable to the liberality and kindness of all parties concerned.

ANSWERS TO CORRESPONDENTS, &c.

Favours have been received from Drs. J. P. Smith—Redford. Rev. Messrs. N. M. Harry—Thomas Russell—C. N. Davies—J. Pyer—Algernon Wells—Thos. James—Thos. Milner—J. Clapp—Joseph Morison—J. S. Pearsall.—S. Luke.

Also from Sir Culling Eardley Smith, Bart.—Messrs. E. Swaine—G. Burnet—Ed. Phillips—Rice Hopkins—Thomas Beale—A Reader—A Constant Reader.

We regret that Mr. Milner's article did not come to hand till our pages were made up: it shall appear in our next.

We agree with our valued friend, Dr. Redford, that we have allowed too many polemical articles to appear in our pages of late. We must, if possible, close several of these discussions with the year.

We owe an apology to the Rev. Thomas Russell, for having again postponed his paper. It will, however, certainly appear in our next.

Mr. Beale's long communication is referred to the Reviewer of his work for consideration. He shall hear from us in the course of the month, or publicly in our next number.

We beg to inform our readers that our next will be a double number, a part of which will be devoted to *A Statistical View of the State of Religious Parties in the Colonial Empire of Great Britain*.